

FOREWORD

I have been asked to write a Foreword to this reprint of one of the early numbers of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series of Tirupati. To write a foreword to the text of so great an Upanishad as Isavasya with the Bhashya of so great a philosopher as Sri Vedanta Desika and an introduction, translation and notes in English by two eminent modern scholars is to hold a candle to the sun. The best that I could do is to say four words "Thank you very much" to the Vedanta Desika Research Society and its active worker Sri V. Srinivasa Raghavan for the service they are rendering to the public by publishing such works. Such publications will help all of us to acquire and improve our acquaintance with our ancient cultural heritage and evoke in us an active desire for its deeper study, so that we may live a life worthy of the inheritors of that great heritage.

A NARAYANA PAI
*Retired Chief Justice
Mysore High Court*

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE

Vedanta Desika chose only one Upanishad—Isavasya Upanishad to write a commentary and only one of the Alvars Pasurams—Thiruppanalwar's Amanalathipuran to interpret in great detail. So we decided to publish the Acharya's interpretation of Isavasya Upanishad as the Fourth Book in our series. Two great authoritative and devout scholars the late Panditha Raja D T Thathachariar and Dr K C Varadachariar of Thirupathi had published an erudite edition under the auspices of Thirumalai Thirupathi Devasthanam series. Though it had run into two editions it was long out of print. This is another reason for our printing this book in our series.

We are grateful to the Executive Officer of the Thirumalai-Thirupathi Devasthanam for permitting us to re print the book in our series. We have added two brilliant essays by the late Dr K C Varadachari in the Appendix. Both these being original articles by the great scholar throws a flood of light on two aspects of the Upanishad which will be a delight to Researchers and a useful study for students of this Upanishad.

Our first publication on Subhashithanivi and our Second on Hamsa Sandesa were reviewed appreciatively by the Internationally well-known magazines of Baroda University and Punjab University. Our third Publication on Tatparya Ratnavali and Sarath which was published for the first time was welcomed as not only an excellent publication, but also a necessary one, as it was not well known to many of our Vaishnavites.

We expect this book will receive the same appreciative reception as our previous three books in our Homage to Desika Series from the scholarly world.

We are grateful to Retired Chief Justice A Narayana Pai for his encouraging foreword. We are indebted to Sri D S Krishnachar of Prabha Printing House, Bangalore 560 004 for the good printing of the book.

The next publication in our series is on Yadavabhyudayam of Vedanta Desika with text and translation which is now in the press. Sankalpa Suryodayam is also under print. Other works of Sri Desika are under preparation and will follow in quick succession.

V Srinivasa Raghavan
Honorary Secretary

CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	1-39
Isavasyopanisad bhashyam Text (in Sanskrit)	1-28
Isavasyopanisad bhashyam Translation	29-75
Quotations cited by Sri Vedanta Desika	76-79
Appendix I	80-89
Appendix II	90-106



VEDANTA DESIKA IN THIRUVAHINDRAPURAM

ISĀVĀSYOPANISAD—BHĀŚYA OF VENKATANĀTHA

INTRODUCTION

This is the first of the Ūpanisad bhāśyas according to Viśistādvaita Philosophy undertaken for being translated into English with critical notes. The importance of this kind of work needs hardly be exaggerated. Philosophy and Religion, it will be seen, owe their deepest inspiration to the fine and excellent theism breathing through these Ūpanisads. Through the ages, the culture of India was imbibed from these unfailing springs of spiritual consciousness that had its roots in Divine Knowledge, Divine Action and Divine Devotion culminating in Divine Birth. The necessity to rescue Philosophy and Religion from futilities of political and social inertia is everywhere felt. A divine consciousness must once more take possession of our entire being and transmute us and lead us on the Divine Path. Such a promise is eminently capable of being fulfilled by students and practisers of the Īśvara-Yoga.

THE LIFE OF SRI VENKATANATHA

Śrī Venkatanātha, the most important thinker of the Viśistādvaita School of Philosophy after Śrī Rāmānuja was born at Tūppul, a suburb of Kāñcī (modern Conjeevaram), in the Tamil month of Purattāśi of the year *Vibhava* corresponding to the 17th September 1268 A. D. As Śrī Venkatanātha was born under the asterism Śravaṇa, the asterism of Śrī Venkateśa of the famous Tīrumalai shrine, he was named after Him. Tradition has it that Śrī Venkatanātha's father Ananta

Srī and mother Totarammā visited the shrine sometime before their illustrious son was born to them, and that one night they dreamt that the Lord of the shrine sent His bell to incarnate as their son. The story is testified to by Srī Venkatanatha himself in his drama *Saṅkalpasūryodaya* ¹

Srī Venkatanātha had a heritage suited to his genius. He was a lineal descendant of a personal disciple of Srī Rāmānuja through his father ². Through his mother he was related to Srī Rāmānuja's personal disciple and nephew Pranatartihara, otherwise known as the Vedānta Udayanācārya. Pranatartihara had a grandson and a grand-daughter, the former was the famous author of *Nyāya Kulisa*, Rāmānuja, and the latter was the mother of Srī Venkatanatha. Thus from his infancy, he grew up in the midst of the tradition of Srī Rāmānuja's philosophy.

Srī Venkatanatha was brought up by his uncle, Ātreya Rāmānuja familiarly known as Appullar. Srī Venkatanatha manifested signs of being a genius. His memory was very keen and he required no second reading. His extraordinary retentive powers in this respect were displayed, it seems, on more than one occasion. When very young and yet a child, his remarkable memory was manifested when he assisted in giving the clue to the great Nadatur Vatsya Varadācārya in one of his discourses. The manner he seems to have done this was still more remarkable, as he seems

¹ *Saṅkalpasūryodaya* I Act 15 v

² J B R A S, 1915 16 p 379

to have done this without violating the injunction of the scriptures not to repeat the scriptural text without proper instruction from a Guru

When he reached the appropriate age he was initiated into spiritual life by his uncle and he continued to study everything under him. He completed all his studies by his twentieth year. His knowledge was encyclopaedic and this fundamental equipment of his studies is displayed in his very early works too.

He married about his twentieth year. His married life seems to have been very fortunate. It shows none of those conflicts that so much marred the life of Śrī Rāmānuja. On the contrary he was excellently married, and his life as a householder was an ideal one. Happy nations as a rule have no history to leave behind them, so too happy couples. When Śrī Venkatanatha pleads for the life of a householder as more befitting to man than the more arduous Sannyāsīn's, one can infer that married life is a life of responsibility to oneself and to one's community and race, which provided it is lived properly, will yield the highest bliss possible to the human being on this planet. We cannot say exactly how long it lasted or how long his wife lived. We only know that he was father of a son about his forty-seventh year of life, nearly twenty eight years after his marriage (1316 A D).

Soon after his marriage Śrī Venkatanatha went to Tiruvahindrapuram (near modern Cuddalore, South Arcot District), a beautiful hamlet situated on the banks of the river Garuda (Gadilam). This was the period of perfect preparation and meditation and penance.

He attained in the course of his first two years there miraculous powers from Śrī Hayagrīva (Śrī Viṣṇu of the form of Hayagrīva) and also from Garuda. Perhaps it is through their blessings he turned to melodious versification and produced hymns in praise of Devanayaka and Hayagrīva. It was also during this period he began his discourses on the Śrī Bhasya, Bhagavad Gita and on the secret doctrines of the Viśiṣṭādvaita. He also became a master of arts and crafts, and attained such proficiency as to be called *Sarvatantra-svatantra* ¹

His life at Tiruvahindrapuram seems to have lasted about twenty years. He exemplified in himself profoundest wisdom of the Upanisads and Prabandham. For him, ordinary life regulated and governed by total surrender to the Lord is no menace to spiritual communion and development. All actions prescribed by the scripture have to be performed, for there is no way open to man other than service of the Divine. A life of renunciation (*vairāgya*) can go along with the human conditions of love and possession of children. He seems to have followed *uñcha vr̥tti*, the profession of begging for rice for his daily needs, thus typifying utter dependency for maintenance on God to whose service he had consecrated himself.

It is just possible that Śrī Venkatanātha became conscious of his mission in life about this time. It is one of those recurring facts of psychological consciousness of a sect or community, religious or secular, to seek

¹ A well that Śrī Venkaṭanātha constructed can even now be seen at Tiruvahindrapuram as also the image cast of him by himself.

to endow its chief teacher or messiah, who had brought unity and solace to that community, with all the glory of a son of God. Supernatural claims have always been made on behalf of almost all great personalities. It has great value and evangelical force during the period of the mission. The leaders themselves because of their sincere and abiding consciousness of their duty to their God, accept the mantle of this great responsibility. Śrī Venkatanātha was no exception to this. The dream prophecy was there. He had to accept the mantle that God had destined him for. His abiding concern seems to have been to dispel the darkness and demoniac fury of unspiritual forces encircling his community, whilst himself increasing the spiritual light and power of his own community. This twofold purpose of destruction of anti spiritual forces and increasing of spiritual forces, or in the words of the *Itāvāsyopanīṣad*, increasing the birth-forces whilst destroying the death-forces seems to have been his main concern. It is this consciousness, tri polar as it is, that pervades like the perfume eternal, the entire conduct of Śrī Venkatanātha. In all his works there is mastery as well as complete surrender to the Divine. In all his dealings there is the sacred presence of divine humility. It is this that has made him the most relentless opponent of all that is trash and an admirer of all that is noble and lofty and godly.

His life of preparation for the great mission having been over he started on a pilgrimage tour to the famous shrines sprinkled all over India, this being one of the most important duties of every Hindu. He left for Kāñci, and on the way, he visited the famous

Tirukeilūr temple where he composed the *Dehalīṣa-stuti*, on the Lord Dehalīṣa who manifested Himself to the first three Ālvārs, Poygai, Bhūta and Pey.

His stay at Kañci was short. Like the Ālvārs, he composed a hymn on the most important shrines he visited in South India. He composed a hymn at Kāñci on Varadaraja—the *Varadarāja pañcāśat*. His next halt was at Tirupatī, where he composed the magnificent *Dayā śataka* on his patron Deity. From Tirupatī he seems to have visited Śrīśaila, Ahobīlam and other places. He proceeded to the north visiting the famous places of History of Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Badarī and Jagannāth Pūrī. On his return journey he seems to have visited Tirupatī and then Kañci. This pilgrimage seems to have lasted about five years. We do not have any detailed account about this itinerary. There are no compositions on or praises of any deity in Northern India.

No sooner than he returned to Kañci, he was invited to Srīrangam to take part in a debate with an advaitic scholar in the year 1310 A.D. The leaders at Srīrangam were unable to meet the arguments advanced by the advaitic scholar, and as Śrī Venkatanātha inherited the mantles of Śrī Bhaṣya *simhāsanādhipatī* and Prabandha-*simhāsanādhipatī* after the demise of his uncle Ātreya Ramanuja, he was invited to refute those arguments. Śrī Venkatanātha successfully refuted the arguments of the advaitic teacher¹ and thus won for himself laurels and encomium. He was given the title of *Vedāntātārya*—the master teacher of Vedānta². He was now the

1 It appears that the Advaitic teacher was one Kṛṣṇa Miśra. We are not able to state definitely whether this was the author of the *Prabodha candrodaya*. But it is likely.

2 *Adhikarāṇa Saravali* opening verse

acknowledged leader of the Philosophy of Viśiṣṭadvaita. The two divisions of the Śrī Vaiṣṇava thought, the northern and southern, which Śrī Ramanuja had unified in his person after Yamunācārya, tended to fall asunder as the seat of the Chief of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism had to be at two capitals. Kañci had always been the seat of great literary activity not merely of Viśiṣṭadvaita but also of all other schools of thought. The literary fulcrum thus was at Kāncī. Śrīrangam was the shrine of Prabhāṇḍa literature—that is its main interest was in the devotional poetry of the Ālvārs. The chiefs who followed Śrī Ramanuja seem to have followed the principle of living in both capitals by turns. But when old age overtook them they could not undertake the task of moving between one place and the other. Thus there grew up two schools: one which was at Kañci under the direct inspiration and presence of the Chief, and another that found chiefs at Śrīrangam itself to cater to the needs of the devotees there. But this divergency seems to have been overcome in the year 1310 when Śrī Venkatanātha who resided at Tiruvāṇḍrapuram, which is mid way between the two places, decided to spend his days at Śrīrangam.

It was about this time he began writing his great commentaries on the Śrī Bhasya, Gīta Bhasya and wrote down his *rahasyas*. Śrī Venkatanātha was a synthetic thinker and a provisional realist. His aim had been to create the conditions of a renaissance Hinduism which did not belittle anything of the former heritage of the Vedas, Upaniṣads, Smṛtis, Purāṇas and the Mīmāṃsā. His method of interpretation always aimed at the synthesis of the entire content of the

traditional knowledge and lore. It was not, as he himself said, a new methodology, but rather it was the rejuvenation of the ancient methodology that marked the Vedāntasutrahāra, Jaimini, Bodhāyana, Rāmānuja and his own teachers Nadatur Ammāl and Ātreya Rāmānuja. It is the perfecting of this methodology that earned for him the unique title of *Deśika* or Ācārya.

It is one of the most important features of Viśiṣṭādvaitic thought that it exemplified the truth, that truth in whatever language expressed is truth, provided it stands the test of criticism. The great contribution which Śrī Vekatanatha made to Viśiṣṭadvaita literature was to explain the unity of the teaching of the Ālvārs and the Upaniṣads. Three streams of thought flowed into the river of Viśiṣṭādvaita, the Vedas, Upaniṣads including the smṛti and itihāsas and purāṇas, and the tantras represented by the Pañcarātra, and the Tamil compositions of the Ālvārs. It is the confluence of these three streams that culminated in the writings of Śrī Venkatanatha who composed with equal facility in both sanskrit and tamil, and stamped Viśiṣṭadvaita with the austere thought of Vedānta, the worship of the Āgama, and the beauty of the Ālvārs' wisdom. Viśiṣṭadvaita awaited the arrival of a genius to do this task and it got the seer to do it in Śrī Venkatanatha. No surprise then that Śrī Venkatanātha was affectionately and admiringly called the Ācārya. To speak about *Deśika* is to speak about Viśiṣṭadvaita. The dream and wish of Yamunacārya got its fullest realization in the person of Śrī Venkatanatha.¹

¹ See *Life of Ramanuja*

This was the peak of his life. His mission was started under excellent auspices. Everywhere there was admiration for the master. In 1316 A D Śrī Venkatanātha was the proud father of a boy who, it appears, possessed all the great qualities of his illustrious father. It was as if the life of completest happiness¹ was vouchsafed for Śrī Venkatanātha.

But the life that promised such a luminous future was assailed by petty jealousies. The tendentious activities of rival schools began to manifest uncomfortable forebodings of a disruption. Unfortunately it began to centre round the person of Śrī Venkatanātha. Personal insults, slights and even severe man handling seem to have taken place. People began to refuse co-operation to him in the performance of oblations to his manes, a row of sandals was hung at the door step of his residence so that it could strike him when he came out. These trials on his patience made him understand that despite all that he could do to soothen the embittered feelings, and despite his willingness to treat them as of no serious concern, and despite his general sense of humour, he was not wanted at Srīrangam. Thus he left Srīrangam about the year 1319 A D for Satyamangalam¹ on the borders of Mysore unwilling to be the cause of serious cleavage in the community. It was perhaps during this period between 1310 and 1319 A D he was challenged to compose in one night a poem on the sandals of Śrī Ranganātha by a member of the rival community, which he did, on the completion of

¹ Dr S Krishnaswami Aiyangar holds that it is 'Sattegalē' (Satyakalā) in his review of this book in *Journal of Indian History* Dec 1942

which his superior mastery in composition was acknowledged by the grant of the title '*Kavītārkkasimha*' to him by the learned assembly of Judges. That work is known as *Pādukā-Sahasram*. It is also probable that Śrī Venkatanātha composed the *Saṅkalpasūryodaya* about this time.

After a few years, lasting about five years, he seems to have been once again called upon to refute another advaitic scholar at Śrīrangam. Śrī Venkatanātha returned to Śrīrangam and defeated the opponent through the offices of his disciple *Brahmatantrasvāmī*. It is presumably as a result of these series of debates that Śrī Venkatanātha composed the *Satadūṣanī* so as to be helpful to the students and teachers of Viśiṣṭadvaita to refute the opposing schools. It is also likely that the *Paramata bhāṅga* was composed with the same intention.

It appeared that after the cloud of mistrust and jealousy that marred his life between 1319 A D and 1325 A D, there had come after all the bright sunshine. But this was not to be. Scarcely a year afterwards the invading hordes of Malik Kafur were pressing down wards into South India carrying with them the flames of relentless persecution and massacre and vandalism. Idol worship or rather Pratimā-worship, which is one of the most important elements of Śrī Vaisnava religion, was assailed. Idols of worship were removed from the sanctuaries to interior places for fear of desecration and spoliation and mutilation. Śrīrangam underwent this fiery ordeal in 1326 A D. Śrī Vedānta Deśika, Śrī Pillai Lokācārya and other eminent leaders of Vaiṣṇavism had to flee. People numbering ten

thousand staunch devotees, were massacred in attempting to stem the onslaught of the Moslem leader, whilst Śrī Vedānta Deśika and Śrī Pillai Lokācārya hurried away from the city in possession of the Śruta-prakaśika-commentary on the *Śrī Bhāṣya* and the Image of Śrī-ranganātha. After some arduous journey Śrī Venkatanātha went to Mysore. It is likely that his son and wife were living at Satyamangalam at this time or were sent to that place just previous to the invasion apprehending danger. So much so, there is no mention of them in this escapade from Srirangam.

After some years spent in the old place of exile of Śrī Rāmanuja, Tirunārāyanapuram, he seems to have returned to his old haunt Satyamangalam in 1335 A.D. It is recounted that during this period of exile, his old friend Śrī Vidyaranya Swāmin, the minister of king Bukka I, the founder of the Vijayanagar, the capital of the great Empire of Vijayanagar, invited Śrī Venkatanātha to reside at the Court of Vijayanagar, obviously moved by the impecunious circumstances of Śrī Venkatanātha. It appears that though moved by this offer, Śrī Venkatanātha courteously declined this honour and help, with five verses breathing rare beauty and humility. He was content to enjoy the wealth that God had infinitely given him, the wealth of knowledge.¹ For him there was no place for compromise in religious life just as there was no compromise with falsity.

Śrī Vedānta Deśika continued to live a quiet and peaceful life delivering lectures and discourses on the many points of the doctrine. He had already written

¹ cf. The ideal of the *Īśa*, 1 & cf. Janaka's famous couplet "Anantam bata me vittam."

innumerable hymns, controversial works and commentaries, and composed original kāvya. It was in every sense a peaceful period. As usual his disciples flocked to him at this new shrine of power. There was only one dark cloud, the cloud that darkened the sky of Hindu Religion. It was only about thirty years afterwards that the Hindu Empire founded at Vijayanagar grew sufficiently powerful to drive out the invaders. It is stated that sorely grieved Śrī Venkatanātha composed the *Abhīti stava* about this time. Almost in response to this prayer of the devotee, God seems to have, through the instrumentality of one Gopanārya, a General stationed at Gingee, driven out the last of the invaders from Śrīrangam and installed the Idol of Śrīranganātha who had been moved from place to place during those thirty years. This was in 1361 A D. Knowing this fact Śrī Venkatanātha returned to Śrīrangam rejoicing in this answer to his prayers. The two verses that he wrote praising the services of Gopanārya are even today to be seen incised on the wall at Śrīrangam.

Having lived a full life of service (*kaṣṭhikārya*) in the cause of the philosophy of Śrī Ramanuja, Śrī Vedanta Deśika passed away in the month of Kārtṭhikai Saumya year 1369 A D. Thus came an end a great epoch in Viśiṣṭādvaita.

II

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ŚRĪ VENKATANATHA

The philosophy of Śrī Venkatanātha cannot be summarised within the short compass of an introduction. But certain general outlines can be drawn. The

Philosophy of Śrī Venkatanātha is identical with that of Śrī Rāmānuja, and it is considered that the great merit of Śrī Venkatanātha's writings lies in the synthesis and correlation that he has made between the several thinkers who preceded him. He has referred to almost all his predecessors and has criticised them or supplemented their views with arguments revealing wealth of understanding altogether unsurpassed. His life was on the philosophical side consecrated to unravelling the intricate points of philosophical value which might lead to a synthetic understanding of the Vedic and Upanisadic literature and Prabandhic thought. This of course was necessitated by the tendency of many followers of the central thought of Śrī Rāmānuja to interpret onesidedly. On the other hand, the constant revival of philosophical disputations between rival sects or philosophies imposed on the philosopher the obligation to substantiate his subtle Organistic viewpoint. It is more easy to accept a materialistic monism or pluralism or a spiritualistic monism or pluralism, but it is difficult to tread the path of Synthesis that orders all existence or reality on the basis of a central principle of Organic relationship. This difficult task to which he addressed himself required prodigious labour and persistent attention to details. It is usual for most philosophers to take a very comprehensive view without entering into the manifold details of the scheme or order adumbrated. That satisfies superficial souls or believers but that cannot satisfy the carping critic who would insist upon the manifold details being filled in. This was the task imposed on the leader, and Śrī Venkatanātha, the giant he was, undertook the working

out of the innumerable details of the system not only on its philosophical side, but also whenever the philosophical phased into praxis and ethics, and all this without losing the fundamental basis of spiritual consciousness of the One All-abiding Divine. This radiant man, spurning all pomp and power and pelf, tenacious and zealous in the cause of promoting a better understanding of the relation between God and man and the world, confident about himself, trusting God, ever at the service of truth, deeply learned in the thought and knowledge of all the literature, whether Sanskrit or Tamil or Prākṛit, a venerable teacher and fierce antagonist, compelling absolute obedience of his disciples, a patient craftsman and rigid follower of the śāstraic injunctions,—Śrī Venkaṭanātha—was the very embodiment of the spirit of Viśiṣṭādvaita. We find that his main desire has been to show the good life, the life that God has imposed or has ordered in the world. The path of realization is not through mere intellectual understanding nor mere works, but through Devotion, Bhakti, which includes the performance of works as well as understanding. The cognitive and conative faculties of man should be directed by the power of devotion to the highest reality, the self of all, and become the Vision of integral Unity. This devotion can be manifested fully and integrally through the understanding of the integral or organic unity of dependence on the Supreme Being, the Lord, who is the final Object of our life (*parama puruṣārtha*). The love of God, faith in His wisdom, in His being our only means of salvation, faith in His perfect love for man and His anxiety to lead man to His own transcendent

puissant place are real and urgently necessary for man's progress. The ideal of the *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* which is herein presented in translation and the *Bhagavad Gītā* teaching mingle harmoniously with the central meaning of the ecstasies of the *Ālvārs*. It is no wonder therefore *Śrī Venkatanātha* finding that a final and absorbing synthesis of Upaniṣadic thought is presented only in the *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad*, commented on this Upaniṣad only.

In all the works that this master has written, there is a unity of purpose, the central purpose, of representing the system of thought for which he stood, of which he was the most important representative evangel for nearly a century. He has written a masterpiece of logic and dialectic such as the *Tattva-muktakalāpa* with his own commentary *Sarvārtha-siddhi*. This, in his own words, stands as a testimony to his omniscient understanding and grasp of all systems of thought. His renovating efforts in the sphere of logic are illustrated by his *Nyaya-parisuddhi*, *Nyaya-siddhānjanam* and *Sesvara mīmamsa*. His controversial works are his *Satadūṣanī* and his *Paramatabhanga*, and *Vāditraya-khandana*. His expository works and commentaries are the *Tattva-tīka* on the *Śrī Bhāṣya*, *Tatpātya candrikā* on the *Gīta-Bhāṣya*, *Adhikaraṇa sāravalī* on the *Śrī Bhāṣya*, *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad bhāṣya* on the Upaniṣad, *Pañcarātra raksā* and others. His poetic talent and mastery of composition are displayed in his *Yadavābhyudaya* (modelled on the *Raghuvamśa*), *Hamsasandēśa* modelled on the *Meghadūta*, *Saṅkalpa-suryodaya* as a counterblast to the *Prabodha candrodaya*, and his *Subhāṣitanī* modelled perhaps on the *Bhartrhari's* *Satakas* and the *Pādukā*.

sahasra. In addition he has composed 30 hymns on the several deities. He has written extensively on the inner secret doctrines of the Śrīvaiśnavas. On the whole he seems to have composed 118 works, a prodigious output of literary and philosophical value. His works have been acclaimed as of the highest quality by his contemporaries as well as his successors. The famous Appayya Dīksita has written the commentary on his *Yādavabhyudaya*—which shows the high esteem in which that famous Advaitic scholar held Śrī Venkaṭa-nātha.

Despite the fact that his logical and philosophical thought had not been paid attention to as much as it deserves by monistic idealists such as Prof. S. N. Das Gupta¹ and others, he requires to be studied as a careful thinker in logic who seeks to supplant the mere ideological theories of idealism by a more profound understanding of the intuitive logic which corresponds most closely to Organistic conception. The instrument of thought must be of the same order as the metaphysical system in which it finds a place. Logical theories cannot be sundered apart from their metaphysical bases. It is true that an inductive study of thought and its principles will yield us a truly critical account of logic. Such a logic, however, should have to presume the reality of its own account. An inductive study of thought will not be able to overstep its own shadow or presuppositions. It must start with the experience it finds, rather than seek to transplant itself elsewhere. It is this demand of realistic thought that happens to be the safest level of experience. Thought,

1. History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. III.

building itself upon such foundations, will finally construct its edifice of knowledge on the surest bases of science and human experience not excluding any experience of which the human being may be capable. Religious and mystical consciousness and even the realization of the Divine fall within this scheme of understanding. It is this that Śrī Venkatanātha seeks to achieve through his logical works. In organic hypothesis, thus, the foundations of thought are well-laid and are capable of being intuitive and intellectual, pragmatic and ethical.

To have laid the foundations of this kind of logic is the greatest contribution of Śrī Venkatanātha. It is unfortunately true however that this great work has not been continued after him as splendidly as may be desired.

III

THE TWO RECENSIONS

The *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* forms the final chapter out of the forty which constitute the *Vājasaneyā Samhitā* of the White Yajur Veda.¹ There are two recensions of the above *samhitā* namely the *Kāṇva* and the *Madhyandina*. The *Upaniṣad*, as we have it, belongs to the *Kāṇva* school. There are, however, slight differences between the *Samhitā* text and the *Upaniṣad* text.

(1) In the *V* mantra² there is added *u* between *tad*

1 *Sukla Yajur Veda* was revealed to Ṛṣi Yajñavalkya by the Sun in the form of Hayagrīva or Vajra (horse).

2 In the text used by all the commentators, with the exception of Śrī Venkatanātha the *V*th mantra first pada omits the *u* between *tad* and *na*.

and *na* in the first pāda, and between *tad* and *antike* in the second pāda. (ii) In the VI mantra the Samhitā reading is *Ātmanneva*. The Upaniṣad reads *Atmanyeva*, and (iii) finally the Samhitā-Upaniṣad when recited as part of the Samhitā ends with the words *OM Kham Brahma*.

The differences as between the two recensions are very many. An understanding of these helps considerably our appreciation of the Bhāṣya of Sri Venkatanātha at more than one place. The two recensions are given below. The Kānva version is given here as Upaniṣad and not as Samhitā.

KĀNVA (K)

MĀDHYANDINA (M)

हरिः ओम्

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वं
यत्किञ्च जगत्सा जगत् ।
तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथा
मा गृयः कस्यस्त्रिद्वन्द्वम् ॥ | ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वं
यत्किञ्च जगत्सां जगत् ।
तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथा
मा गृयः कस्यस्त्रिद्वन्द्वम् ॥ | 1 |
| 2. कुर्मन्नेवेह कर्माणि
जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।
एव त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति
न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ | कुर्मन्नेवेह कर्माणि
जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।
एव त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति
न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ | 2 |
| 3. असुर्यां नाम ते लोका
अन्धेन तमसाऽऽवृताः ।
तांस्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति
ये के चामहना जनाः ॥ | असुर्यां नाम ते लोका
अन्धेन तमसाऽऽवृताः ।
तांस्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति
ये के चामहनो जनाः ॥ | 3 |

4. अनेजदेकं मनसो जवीयो अनेजदेकमनसो जवीयो
 नैनदेवा आप्नुवन् पूर्वमर्षत् । नैनदेवा आप्नुवन् पूर्वमर्षत् ।
 तद्भावतोऽन्यानत्येति तिष्ठ- तद्भावतोऽन्यानत्येति तिष्ठ-
 तस्मिन्नपो मातरिश्वा दधाति ॥ तस्मिन्नपो मातरिश्वा दधाति ॥ 4
5. तदेजति तदु नैजति तदेजति तन्नैजति
 तद्दे तद्वन्तिके । तद्दे तद्वन्तिके ।
 तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य
 तदु सर्वस्यास्य बाह्यतः ॥ तदु सर्वस्यास्य बाह्यतः ॥ 5
6. यस्तु सर्वाणि भूता- यस्तु सर्वाणि भूता-
 न्यात्मन्येवानुपश्यति । न्यात्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
 सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं
 ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥ ततो न विचिकित्सति ॥ 6
7. यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूता- यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूता-
 न्यात्मैराभूद्विजानतः । न्यात्मैराभूद्विजानतः ।
 तत्र को मोहः कश्चोक्त तत्र को मोहः कश्चोक्त
 एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥ एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥ 7
8. स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमत्रण- स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमत्रण-
 मन्नाशिरं शुद्धमपापविद्धम् । मन्नाशिरं शुद्धमपापविद्धम् ।
 कर्मिर्मेनीषी परिभूः स्वयंभू- कर्मिर्मेनीषी परिभूः स्वयंभू-
 र्यापातय्यतोऽर्थान्व्यदधाच्छा- र्यापातय्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छा-
 श्वतीम्यः समाभ्यः ॥ श्वतीम्यः समाभ्यः ॥ 8
9. अन्धं तमः प्रविशन्ति अन्धं तमः प्रविशन्ति
 येऽविद्यामुपासते । येऽनंभूतिमुपासते ।

1. Verses 9-11 in the Mādhyandina recension are identical with the 12-14 of the Kāṣya recension whereas 12-14 M are identical with K.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|
| | ततो भूय इव ते तमो
य उ विद्याया रता ॥ | ततो भूय इव ते तमो
य उ सभूल्या रता ॥ | 9 |
| 10 | अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्ययाऽ
न्यदाहुरविद्यया ।
इति शुश्रुम धीराणा
ये नस्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ | अन्यदेवाहु सभवा-
दन्यदाहुरसभवात् ।
इति शुश्रुम धीराणा
ये नस्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ | 10 |
| 11. | विद्या चाविद्या च
यस्तदेदोभय सह ।
अविद्यया मृत्यु तीर्त्वा
विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ | सभूति च विनाश च
यस्तदेदोभय सह ।
विनाशेन मृत्यु तीर्त्वा
सभूल्याऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ | 11 |
| 12 | ¹ अन्य तम प्रविशन्ति
येऽसभूतिसुपासते ।
ततो भूय इव ते तमो
य उ सभूल्या रता ॥ | अथ तम प्रविशन्ति
येऽविद्यामुपासते ।
ततो भूय इव ते तमो
य उ विद्याया रता ॥ | 12 |
| 13. | अन्यदेवाहु सभवा
दन्यदाहुरसभवात् ।
इति शुश्रुम धीराणा
ये न स्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ | अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्याया
अन्यदाहुरविद्यायाः ।
इति शुश्रुम धीराणा
ये न स्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ | 13 |
| 14 | सभूति च विनाश च
यस्तदेदोभय सह ।
विनाशेन मृत्यु तीर्त्वा
सभूल्याऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ | विद्या चाविद्या च
यस्तदेदोभय सह ।
अविद्यया मृत्यु तीर्त्वा
विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ | 14 |

1. The 17 M is a composite verse comprising parts of the 15 and 16 K

15. हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण

सत्यस्यापि हत मुखम् ।

तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु

सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ।

16. पूषन्नेकैर्षे यम सूर्य प्राजापत्य

व्यूह रस्मीन् समूह तेजो

यत्ते रूप कल्याणतम तत्ते

पश्यामि । योऽसावसौ पुरुषः । सोऽहमस्मि ॥

17. वायुरनिलममृत-

यथेद भस्मान्त शरीरम् ।

ओं क्रतो स्मर कृत स्मर

क्रतो स्मर कृत स्मर ॥

वायुरनिलममृत-

यथेद भस्मान्त शरीरम् ।

ओम् क्रतो स्मर

क्लृवे स्मर कृत स्मर ॥

15

18. अग्ने नय सुपथा राये अस्मान्

विश्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान् ।

युयोध्यस्मज्जुह्वराणमेनो

भूयिष्ठा ते नमउर्कित विधेम ॥

अग्ने नय सुपथा राये अस्मान्

विश्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान् ।

युयोध्यस्मज्जुह्वराणमेनो

भूयिष्ठा ते नमउर्कित विधेम ॥ 16

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण

सत्यस्यापिहित मुखम् ।

योऽन्तरादित्ये पुरुषः

सोऽसावहम् ॥ ॐ १७ मन्त्र ॥ 17

The following differences between the two texts might be noticed.

- In the third pāda of the third mantra *abhi* is used in *K* in the place of *api* in *M*.

- ii In mantra four second pāda *arsat* in *K* is *arsat* in *M*
- iii The 9, 10, 11 of *K* are the 12, 13 and 14 of *M*, whereas the 9, 10 and 11 of *M* are the 12, 13 and 14 of *K*. The two triads are thus transposed
- iv Another important difference between the two recensions is that where the *K* reads *Vidyayā* and *Avidyā* (10th mantra) which are in the instrumental case standing for the ablative, *M* reads the ablative itself *vidyāyāh* (13 *M*)
- v The 17 and 18 of *K* are 15 and 16 of *M*. The 15 and 16 of *K* are formed into one mantra—that being the 17th and the last of the Madhyandina recension. There is thus elision of the second half of the 15 and the first three padas of the 16th. The fourth pāda is modified thus—*Yo'sāvāditye Purusah so'savaham*
- vi The 17 of *K* reads in the second half *Om Krato smara krtam smara krato smara krtam smara*. The *M* 15 reads *Om hrato smara krtam smara krtatam smara*

It may be noticed in this connection that the Brhadaranyaka Up which belongs to the Śukla Yajus school, reads the four mantras as found in the Iśāvāsyopaniṣad (*Brh Up* V xv 1 ff). It quotes the Iśa 3 and the 9th of the Kanva recension along with many others with the introductory words '*Tadeke śloka bhavanti*' (*Brh Up* IV iv 11). There is, however, a slight difference in the fourth pāda of the third

mantra which reads *Aidvāmsō abuddho janāh* in the place of the *Īśā* text *Ye ke cātmahano janāh* ¹

IV

COMMENTARIES ON THE
ISAVASYOPANISAD

The *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* is one of the most important upaniṣads which has had the benefit of being commented upon by most teachers of Vedānta. Besides the main schools of Vedānta, modern writers and thinkers too have drawn their essential inspiration from this Upaniṣad. The *Anandāśrama*-edition of this Upaniṣad contains besides Śrī Sankara's Bhāṣya and Anandagiri's *tīkā* on it, the commentaries of Uvata and Brahmānanda, Sankarānanda, Ramachandrapandita, Anandabhattopadhyāya and Anantacharya. The Adyar edition has the commentary of Upaniṣad-Brahmayogin which is also based on Śrī Sankara's

¹ A Table of Cross References between the *Īśā* and the other Upaniṣads and the Gīta

Īśā 1 *Śvet Up* IV 20

Īśā 2 *Bh Gīta* IV 14

Īśā 3. *Bṛh, Up* IV iv 11

Īśā 4 5. *Kaṭha Up* I ii 21 *Bh Gīta* XIII 15 *cf Mund*
II : 2 III : 7

Īśā 4 *Kena* I 3

Īśā 6 7 *Kaṭha* II iv 1 4 *Kaṭha* II vi 7, *Bh G* VI, 29
M *Bh* XII 240, 21, *Manu*, XII 91

Īśā 9 *Bṛh Up*, IV iv 10

Īśā 10, 11, 12, 13 14

Īśā 12 *Bṛh M* IV 410

Īśā 15 18 *Bṛh Up* V xv 1

Īśā 15 *cf Manu*. VI 35

Īśā 17 *Bh Gīta* VIII 6

Īśā 18 *Rg Veda* I 183, 1 *Yajus S I* I 14

commentary. The interpretations of these authors are mainly advaitic, and yet there are considerable differences between their comments. There seems to have been a commentary by Bhāskara, but we are unable to get at one and therefore it must have been presumably lost.¹ We shall first consider the structure and plan of the Upaniṣad according to Śrī Sankara and then of Uvvaṭa, the famous commentator on the Vājasaneyā Samhitā, Mādhyandina recension, and finally that of Śrī Venkaṭanātha, incidentally pointing out the differences between these three.

SRI SANKARA

According to Śrī Sankara, the Iśāvāsyopaniṣad teaches the Supreme Self. He considers that not all the mantras herein pertain to this instruction. The chief mantras are 1 and 3-8, that is, in all seven, since these alone instruct the Highest Brahman.

1. The first mantra teaches the advaita-nature of the Self; all else are illusion. He takes *vāsyam* to mean *ūcchādanīyam*, fit to be hidden. This interpretation forces him to read *tyakta* as *tyāga*. *Bhuñjīthāh* means protection instead of enjoyment (which is the meaning grammatically speaking, since this is derived from the root *Bhuj* *ātmanepadin*, when it means other than protection, (*bhujo'narvane* : *Pāṇini* I, iii. 66).

1. cf. *Bhāskara Bhāṣya*, Chaukhamba p. 84.

उन्धोमे च तत्र तत्रानयोर्मावाप्रमित्ररादिनोर्निराकरणं विस्तरेण वृत्तमित्युप-
गमिष्ये ।

This leads us to suspect that other commentaries also existed.

2 The second mantra is declared by him as teaching a different method to the ignorant man who is unable to grasp the significance of the first mantra

This, it is to be noticed, is a serious diversion from the main instruction said to have been started, as Śrī Sankara says in his introductory words thus

*Karmasu aviniyuktah, tesām akarma-
śesasya atmano yāthatmya-prakaśakatvāt
Na Karma lipyate Nare* is said to refer to
bad actions—*aśubham karma*

3 The third mantra is merely a denunciation of the follower of the lower path (*avara marga*)

4 The fourth mantra begins with the instruction of the Self. In this mantra *apas* is interpreted to mean *karma*

5 The fifth mantra is merely a reiteration of the fourth, *mantrānam jāmīta 'stuti purvamantroktam apyartham punaraha*

6 7 The seventh mantra is said to be the reiteration of the sixth, and in the sixth mantra Śrī Sankara says *prapṭasyaiva anuvadoyam*

8 The eighth mantra is said to deal with the Nature of the Supreme Self. Taking the words *Sukram* and others to be nominative neuter, Śrī Sankara converts them all into nominative masculine just like *Kavīḥ Manuḥ* and others. *Paryagat* is taken almost in an intransitive sense

9 From the ninth onwards, according to Śrī Sankara, there is not one single mantra which can be taken to refer to the main theme of the Upaniṣad,

namely, the Self, are anything that helps the realization of it. In the *Avidyā-Vidyā* triad (9-11) *Avidyā* which means vedic *karma* is said to lead to *Pitrloka*, the world of *Manes*, and *Vidyā* which means knowledge of gods is said to grant *devaloka* or the world of gods.

12-14 The *Sambhuti asambhuti* triad teaches the meditation on *Hiranyagarbha* and Unmanifest matter (*Avyakta prakṛti*) the results of meditation on which are quite different from one another. Because the results are different both have to be performed. In the fourteenth mantra Śrī Sankara takes *sambhuti* to mean *asambhuti*—*sambhutam ca vinasam cetyatra avarnalopena nirdeśo drastavyaḥ*.

15-18 These mantras are all prayers made by the person unable to practise the knowledge of the Self which has been taught earlier, that is the person mentioned as practising the *avidyā* and *vidyā*, and presumably also *asambhuti* and *sambhuti*. But during the prayer, in the 16th verse, fourth pada, Śrī Sankara suggests that the worshipper is begging Him (the Self) not as a servant but that he is himself the *Puruṣa* who resides in the Solar Orb (*Ādityamandala*).

Śrī Sankara interprets *Vidyā* as pertaining to the knowledge of the gods, because he finds it difficult to accept the position that supreme knowledge can go with any action as may be seen from his introduction to the 9th mantra and the concluding portion of his *bhasya*, where he raises this question again in the 18th mantra—*tasmat upāsanaḥ samuccayaḥ na paramātmavijñāneneti yatha 'smabhir vyakhyāta eva mantranam artha itruḥparamyaḥ*.

UVVATA

Taking up the interpretation of Uvvata in his commentary on the Vajasaneya saṃhitopaniṣad accord-

ing to the Mādhyandina recension we find that he belongs to the Advaita school

1 He interprets in the first mantra *Vasyam* in the same way as Sankara But he takes *tyaktena* to mean *tyakta-sva svamī-sambandhena* (with which the relation ship of possessor and possession is abandoned) *Bhūñjītāh* is interpreted as *Anubhaveh* enjoy This verb being a transitive one requiring an object, Uvvata suggests that it is the enjoyable objects (*bhogan*)

2 Differing from Sankara, Uvvata says that the counsel to do actions in the second mantra is for the seeker after knowledge and liberation and not for the ignorant man—*nissprhasyaḥ yogo jñānanimulle karmanyadhukāra ityetam artham āha Na karma lipyate nare* is interpreted by Uvvata to refer to action done for the sake of knowledge *Nanu karmanah phalena bhavitavyam, katham mukteḥ prāptih? Ityetad aśankyaḥ*

4-5 According to Uvvata the fourth mantra mentions the causal aspect of Brahman *Evam kāranarūpam ātmānam uddiśyathedanīm kāryarūpenoddīśati*

Uvvata takes *apas* to mean *karma* in the fourth mantra

6-7 The seventh mantra is declared so as to point out as it were further results than the sixth

8 Uvvata takes *paryagāt* in the transitive sense of attained *Sukram* and others, being in the accusative case, supply the object, Brahman The second part of the Mantra is taken to be the result of the seeker's practice of knowledge, the result being the enjoyment of the conscients and the unconscients, abandoning the relation of possessor and possession with them—*atha atmopāsanayuktasya phalam āha yathāśvarūpam arthān vihitavantyakta svasvamī sambandhairarthais cetanā-cetanair upabhogam kṛtavan*

9-14 The rest of the mantras 9-14 are taken as formulas to be repeated (meditated upon and repeated) by the seeker *Ita ullaram upāsanamantrāḥ procyante*

No reason is here shown by Uvvata as to why the six mantras 9-14 should be taken as Upasana mantras, since they do not have the special characteristic of mantras as those found in this Upanisad itself from 15-17. It is just possible that since this Upanisad according to his text—the Mādhyandina—suddenly takes up the conjoint meditation of asambhuti and sambhuti soon after the description of the Deity—the Self of all, he might have thought that there is no special reference to what preceded in these verses. And obviously, because there is the reference to upasana in the mantras *andham tamah praviśanti ye asambhūtim upāsate*

9-11 M (12-14 K) According to Uvvata *asambhūti* refers to the *cartāka*-view¹ whereas *sambhuti* refers to those who hold that there is nothing except the Ātman or self alone—

Lokāyitikāḥ prastūya (prastutya) nindyante, yeśāmetad darśanam jalabudbudavajjivāḥ, mada śakivad vijñānam, itī Andham tamah praviśanti ye asambhūtim upāsate, mrtasya sataḥ punaḥ sambhavaḥ nastī Atah śarīragrahanād asmākam muktireva Je sambhūtyām eva ratāḥ Ātmaiva astī, nānyat kiñcid astityathapṛāyaḥ Karmaṣarūṇāmukhā jat kārma-tanda-jñānakāṇḍjor asambandha ityabhi-
pṛāyaḥ*

1 Most commentators, excluding Venkaṣanātha do not contribute anything original or new, but alternate in their view between Śankara and Uvvata

The 11 M (14 K) shows that both *vināśa* and *sambhūti* which mean ultimately *karma* and self knowledge have to be practised together by the seeker

12 14 M (9 11 K) merely repeats the above view. However in the 12th, *Avidya* means *karma* which grants *svarga* and other minor pleasures. Uvvata's words under the 13th Mantra are significant. *Tadubhayam veda jñāti saha ekibhūtam karma-kandam jñāna-kandasya gunabhūtam*

15 M according to Uvvata describes what happens to the seeker after his exit from the body. His interpretation of the words '*klībe*' in the latter half of the mantra is *klptāya lokaya* to the destined world or a world destined by his *karma*

16 M *Supathā* is *devayana mārگا*, and *rāye* means *muktilaksanāya dhanaya*

17. Here Uvvata takes the mantra as giving instruction in the *Ādiśoṇasana*. He explains *Om hham Brahma* thus *itham ca upasanam kuryat*, *Om kham Brahma* *Om iti nāma-nirdeśah kham iti rūpā nirdeśah* *Akāśa-rūpam Brahma dhyayet*

SRI VENKATANATHA

I. Next we shall consider the *bhasya* of Śrī Venkatanatha in detail. A commentary on any work should display the fundamental integrity or unity of that work, and as far as possible, it should be a study from the stand-point of historical development and synthesis. Unfortunately in the field of Upanisadic thought most commentators have not proceeded from the unitary stand-point, either in respect of its own subject matter or in respect of its continuity with the tradition. There is a widely prevalent modern view that it is wrong to

speak of a unitary philosophy of the Upanisads and the utmost that we might claim is that every Upanisad or some parts thereof are possibly unitary in their import. Thus it is held that a synthesis adumbrated by the Vedanta-sutrakāra is not warranted. Whether or not this is true, whether the Vedanta sutra kara did in fact develop a new theory of his own about the Upanisads, we shall not be certainly in the wrong when we assert that every single Vidyā taught in the Upanisads is a unitary instruction. It is because this fact has not been paid heed to, there have cropped up innumerable errors. It is just to prevent these, a science of interpretational rules or mīmāṃsā has grown up, for interpreting texts dealing with either *dharma* or *Brahman* both of which lead to the ultimate realization. Further the commentator hearing in mind the rules so determined, has to be loyal to the synthesis inherent in each Upanisad or Vidyā and to the logic inherent in all thought. The commentary of Śrī Venkatanātha can be said to fulfil admirably the three fold purpose of being loyal to textual unity, to tradition, and to the rules of interpretation. What Śrī Mallinātha has stated regarding his aim in commenting on any work—that he would not write anything that has no sanction in authority—*namulāṃ likhyate kin it*—nor say anything besides the point—*nanapeksitam ucyate*—applies with equal force to what Śrī Venkatanātha has as a rule, followed in his commentaries. At all crucial points he quotes authorities word for word from Śruti, Smṛti and Viṣṇu Purāṇa.

3 According to Śrī Venkatanātha any upanīṣad or a portion dealing with a vidyā, should be treated as integral instruction which leads to the highest end or goal of man. A proper understanding will reveal that

the several mantras bear a unitary relationship to one another

3 Śrī Venkatanātha interprets the *Īśavasyopaniṣad* on the lines of *Brahma-sūtras*, since it deals with the Supreme Being as *Ātman*. For as *Kātyāyana* opines this entire *Upaniṣad* pertains to the *Ātman-devatā—Īśavasyam ātmadevatyaḥ*¹ Thus firstly it instructs the nature of the Lord, the ultimate category, and secondly, the good means to the realization of Him, and lastly the ultimate goal (*purusārtha*). These three are called according to *Viśiṣṭādvaitic* terminology *tattva*, *hita* and *purusārtha*. The *Brahma sūtras* which comprises four chapters deals in the first the *tattva*—the Brahman, in the second it rejects all views not in agreement with the nature of the ultimate truth already established in the first chapter. The third chapter deals with the means of attainment, *hita* namely the several *vidyās*—*śardūḷya*, *dahara*, and other such meditations. Lastly, in the fourth chapter it describes the realization of the goal of the individual, namely, attainment of Brahman. All these topics are finely indicated by the following hemistich—*karanatvam abādhyatvam upayat-am upayata*. Since the refutation of other doctrines is subordinate to the real comprehension of the truth, it is usually omitted in any instruction given to the seeker. Śrī Venkatanātha introducing the 12th mantra writes

*Tade-am upāśyam paramatmatatt-am, saṅgatadu-
pṣanarupaṅca paramahitam, parama-purusārtha-
paryantam upadīya.—*

4 The *Upaniṣad*, contextually considered is the fortieth and the concluding chapter of the *Vijayaneva Saṃhitā* of the *Sukla Yajurveda* devoted to the performance of works, sacrifices and others. The disciple

for this is that the Self is omnipresent. The final pāda reveals His marvellous omnipresence with respect to vertical existences also.

In the 4th mantra '*apas*' means water, as the accent happens to fall on the last syllable.¹

The fifth mantra whilst reiterating in a different manner the previous mantra adds a further description about the Self being both inside and outside of all things (*sarvasya*).

(iii) The sixth and the seventh mantras form the third subsidiary group, which teaches the immediate results of realization of the omnipervasiveness of the Self, namely the selfness of all things, both subjectively and objectively, that is to say, absence of sorrow and delusion and recoil from anything and everything.

The sixth mantra mentions the relationship between the Self and the creatures as one of supporter and supported, the seventh speaks of them as a co-ordinate unity which is precisely an instance of the principle of interpretation of all identity-texts according to Viśiṣṭadvaita.

(iv) The eighth mantra whilst further describing the nature of the Self and the seeker, by implication suggests the *hita*, the good means to realization of the Lord. It can also be seen that this mantra differentiates between the Self and the seeker as attained and the attainer, soon after their co-ordinate unity was

1 cf *Ita Upaniṣad* Sri Aravinda Ghose p. 4 note 2 '*Apas* as it is accentuated in the version of the White Yajurveda, can mean only waters. If this accentuation is disregarded we may take it as the singular *Apas* work action. Sankara however renders it by the plural works."

cf *Upaniṣad* Brahma yogin also takes this to mean the water-element.

declared in the previous mantra, thus once again affirming that all mention of Oneness is merely a mention of co-ordinate unity (*samānādhikaranya*)

III Major group, consists of six mantras from 9 to 14 This is again subdivided into two subsidiary groups of three mantras each

(1) 9-11 What is briefly mentioned in the second mantra of the Upaniṣad *Kuruvaṇ* is here expanded, and it is pointed out that the practice of works or action should go along with the practice of knowledge, bereft of action knowledge-praxis is dangerous, bereft of knowledge action is foolish Most of the commentators of this group take the word '*anyat*' in the 10th mantra (13 M) and the 13th (10 M) mantra to refer to effects or fruits or results of praxes Venkatanātha on the other hand says that it refers to the *means* alone

Vidyāyā and Avidyāyā though in the instrumental case in the 10th mantra, are taken to be in the ablative case by Venkatanātha, in support of which he refers to the parity with the 13th mantra *sambhavāt* and *asambhavāt* We find that this view is justified because the Madhyandina recension supplies the exact case-ending required

Now to the meaning of the words *Avidyā* and *Vidyā* Almost¹ all the commentators agree that the meanings of *Avidyā* and *Vidyā* are *karma* and knowledge respectively According to Venkatanātha, *Vidyā* means knowledge of the form of meditation (*upāśāna*)

1 Mādhvacharya considers *avidyā* to mean wrong conception of God Sureśvara means by *Avidyā* *niṣiddha karma* and by *vidyā* scriptural *karma* (cf *Bṛhadaranyakopaniṣad vartika*)

to whom it is addressed is one who has already mastered the 39 chapters which precede this final upanisadic or knowledge-chapter. The implication is that the disciple being confused and dissatisfied with them seeks further knowledge about them.

V

THE STRUCTURE AND PLAN OF THE UPANISAD IN DETAIL

1 The first mantra and the second form the first major group, third to eight form the second major group, and nine to fourteen form the third major group, while the last major group consists of the mantras fifteen to eighteen.

2 The 1st Major group serves as an introduction to the Ātmavidyā which follows. The use of the second person singular '*bhūñjīthah*' clearly indicates that these mantras are addressed to a seeking disciple, well trained in the previous portions already taught, who now, like a Naciketas, is seeking the highest truth not to be found in the instructions and practices so far taught. In answer to this search, the first two mantras give a straight-forward and unequivocal direction that the seeker should deem himself to be the property of the Lord, like anything else, and not an independent agent, and that if he performed the prescribed rituals in this consciousness he need not be afraid of bondage resulting from the continuous performance of actions.

Śrī Venkatanatha's interpretation of *vāsyam* is "*vyāpyam, sarvādhare svasmin svena vasaṁyam va*"¹

1 Ramachandra pandita interprets *vāsyam* as *vasayogyam*—*adhiṣṭānena acchadanīyam va*—*nivasārthakad-vaseḥ bahula kadadhikarāṇe nyat* (*Ānandaśrama* ed p 2). Śankarananda writes: "*Tena vāsyam acchadanīyam nivasayogyam va*" (*Ānandaśrama* ed p 2). Upanisad Brahma Yogin writes: *Isa avāsyam vyaptam*, (*Adyar* ed p 7).

The interpretations of the words *tyaktena* and *bhujyithāh*¹ are almost identical with those of Uvvata, to whose bhāṣya we have already referred

(ii) The second mantra² is important in so far as throughout it lays stress on the need for actions being done, it affirms that it is the only way open to any individual (even a seeker, *mumukṣu*), and that he cannot under any circumstances renounce actions prescribed previously in the Samhitā

3 The *II Major group* teaches the nature of the Ātman—the Self of all things This second major group may be said to comprise four sub groups, namely the 3rd, 4-5, 6-7 and 8th Mantras

(i) In the third mantra, the teacher before teaching the true nature of Brahman, points out the results that accrue to those who are the destroyers of the self, namely, those who are ignorant of the self, *avidvāmsah*

(ii) The fourth and the fifth mantras describe the omnipervasiveness of the Self Venkatanātha points out that the mantra 4, whilst revealing the omnipervasiveness indicated in the first mantra, speaks of this Self in apparently incongruous terms, known as *virodhābhāsa* in later *alanīkarika*-terminology, as possessing wonderful power The first pāda of the 4th mantra speaks about the Self as unmoving but swifter than the mind, the second and third pādas show that He could not be overtaken by any one but that He could overtake every one The only explanation

1 Upaniṣad-Brahma Yogin writes *Bhujyithāh Prapnuhi*

2 Bhāṣkara according to Ānandagiri Yaduktam Bhāṣkareṣa sarvāpyupaniṣad ekam brahmavidyā prakaraṇam Tataḥ prakaraṇa-bhedakaraṇam anucitamiti (*Ānandāśrama* ed p 111)

The most important point to be noted in this group is that a conjoint practice of *karma* and *jñāna* is inculcated, *karma* being subsidiary (*aṅga*) to knowledge. Bhāskara accepts this conjoint practice but he considers that *karma* and *jñāna* are equally important in bringing about realization, whereas the scriptural view is definite that knowledge *alone* can bring about realization. Yadava Prakāśa, though accepting conjoint practice of *karma* and *jñāna* (*jñāna karma samuccaya*), thinks that there are two different results, one for *jñāna* and another for *karma*, namely *Brahmaprāpti* and *karma-nivṛtti*. Mandana Mīśra explains the *saha* in the Upaniṣad as the relation of togetherness between means and end, and giving a second explanation says *avidyā* cannot be without *vidyā* nor can *vidyā* be without *avidyā*¹.

This triad of verses according to Venkatanātha also teaches that the means taught herein lead to the attainment of Brahman *Amṛta*, the immortal, the *Parama Puruṣārtha*.

(11) 12 14 *The Sambhūti Asambhūti triad*²

The ordinary meaning of *sambhūti* is birth, and that of *asambhūti* is non birth or dissolution. Some commentators mean by these two terms creation (*srīṣṭi*) and dissolution (*pralaya*). But as this meaning does

1 *Brahma Siddhi* p. 13 pt. I Madras Govt. O. Mss. series 4 (1937) Etad uktam bhavati vidyavidye dve apy upayo peya bhavat sahitē Navidyamantarena vidyodayosti Anyo rīṭah Navidyā Vidyarahitasti tatha hi bheda darśanam api na prakāśasunyam tadabhavē na bhedaḥ prakāśeta—tatha na vidyā aikātmya śṛavanadī lakṣaṇa (*taya* ?) vinavidyāya

2 cf. Śābara X vi 2 *Rik samovaca mīhunam sambhavarēti* Yajus Taṭṭ II v 1 5

not accord with the context, Venkaṭanātha interprets these to mean (1) attainment of Brahman and dissolution of obstacles to it (viz., *samsāra*); (2) *Samādhi-niṣpatti* (communion in trance), and the destruction of all evil tendencies and mental habits pertaining to outer objects; or (3) following a meaning which is given in his *Nyāya siddhāntjana* (p. 162), *sambhūti* means *arcirādi gati* (ascent on the path shown by the Arcis and others), and *asambhūti* means *karmaṇām anyasaṅkrāntiḥ* (transference of karma from the fleeing soul at the time of his departure from his body to those who are his foes). This last view is the interpretation given by Sudarśana Sūri, the author of the inimitable commentary *Śrutā-Prakāśika* on the *Śrī Bhāṣya* (III. iii. 33 & 34).

Śrī Venkaṭanātha in his *Nyāya siddhāntjana* refers to another view put forward by Nārāyaṇārya, the author of the *Nītimālā*. According to him, *sambhūti* and *vināśa* mean knowledge and action, *vidyā* and *karma*. According to this view there is no difference between this triad and the *vidyā-avidyā* triad, of which this is merely a reiteration. Nārāyaṇārya refutes in his *Nītimālā* (p. 64) a view which holds that the words *sambhūti* and *vināśa* mean *saviśeṣa* and *nirviśeṣa* dhyāna respectively, that is to say, the *samprajñāta samādhi* and *asamprajñāta samādhi* mentioned by *Yoga śāstra* (I. 17).

The purpose of this triad is to teach the contemplation of what follow after the death of the seeker. These are (i) *arcirādi gati* and *karma saṅkrānti* or (ii) *Brahma-śrāṇṭi* and *śrāṇṭi bandhātka niṣṭi*. These two interpretations are suggested by the context of this triad in the *Upaniṣad* as it has come to us. If however, we take into consideration the context in which this is found in the *Mādhyandina* recension, it

would appear that it has reference to *Upāsana* or meditation upon the supreme Self, the *tattva* taught in this Upanisad. It is this meaning that Venkatanatha seems to prefer when he gives his second alternative namely *samādhi nīṣpatti* and *manadambhadīnām himsaste-jadīnam bahirmukhendriyavrttinam ca vinasah*. It is significant that Kūranarayana, who is an ardent and faithful follower of Venkatanatha's interpretation gives this meaning alone in his commentary.

IV Major group 15 18

This group is different from all the previous verses in so far as it consists only of mantras, prayers to be repeated by the seeker at the time of his practice (*upāsana*), whereas all the previous mantras, or verses more properly so called, deal with instruction alone. This can be seen by applying the *liṅga* principle of Mīmamsa.¹

The first prayer is for the removal of the obstacles to knowledge, and the purpose of this prayer is merely indicated by the *satya dharmaya dr̥ṣṭave*, and this is expanded in the succeeding mantra.

The third and the fourth mantras are prayers to the Lord to lead the individual soul to the highest bliss, remembering Himself, and what he had done.

The last mantra which is usually used on all occasions, in sacrifice, or hymn, or in the knowledge-section as in this case, has a significance all its own in Upanisadic literature.

1 The *liṅga* principle in Mīmamsa is the principle of expressive power of the words used. Here [in these four mantras] there are vocatives and verbs are used in the second person and first person, and there are personal pronouns in the first and second person.

EDITIONS AND MSS CONSULTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRANSLATION

There are several editions of Venkaṭanātha's *Īśavāsyopaniṣad bhāṣya* I *Īśavāsyopaniṣad bhāṣya* of Vedānta Deśika with the additional commentaries of Kuranāraṇaswamin and Purīṣai Sṛīrangacāryaswamin Ananda Press, Madras 1914 (in Devanagari script) II *Īśavāsyopaniṣad bhāṣya* of Vedānta Deśika with Acārya bhāṣya tatparyā by Tarkārṇava Sīromapi T Vīraraghavacārya of the Sṛī Venkaṭeśwara Sanskrit College 1933 (in Devanagari script) III *Īśavāsyopaniṣad bhāṣya* of Vedānta Deśika with Kuranāraṇaswamin's bhāṣya issued along with the Daśopaniṣad bhāṣya of Rangaramānuja, edited by Navanītam Kṛṣṇnamācārya (grantha script), 1913 All the above have been printed The second amongst the above has been generally followed As there were many doubtful points a Ms. No. 3128 of the Sṛī Venkaṭeśwara Oriental Institute Library and two Ms. of the Madras Govt. Oriental Ms. Library (D. 319 and R. 3192c) were referred to In this connection we feel grateful and obliged to Vidyāśaṣṭripati Prof. P. P. S. Sastry, M.A. (Oxon.), Curator of the Government Oriental Ms. Library, for readily helping us with his readings The Mysore Oriental Library does not contain any Ms. of the above Upaniṣad bhāṣya The variations have been noted in the foot notes at the respective places

टिप्पणीसङ्केतः (पर्यालोचितकोशविषयः)

१. वे. भा. श्रीवेङ्कटनाथभाष्यम् ।
२. कू. भा. श्रीकूर्नारायणभाष्यम् ।
३. कृ. श्रीकृष्णमाचार्यग्रन्थाक्षरे मुद्रित कू. भा. सहित वे.भा.
४. बी. श्रीरीराघवाचार्यरिचितव्याख्यानसह मुद्रितम् ”
५. वे. श्रीमद्देवान्तदेशिकग्रन्थमालान्तर्गतम् ”
६. श्री. श्री श्रीरङ्गाचार्य श्रीकू भाष्याभ्या सहितम् ”
७. ता. एतद्विमर्शाख्यसम्बन्धी वे. भा. तालपत्रकोश ।
८. आ. आनन्दाश्रमे प्रकाशित कू. भा.
९. गो. श्री. तिरुपति गोगुठी श्रीनिवासाचार्य. परिशोधितम् शाङ्कर-
भाष्यतद्याख्यानसहित १८७० अत्र एतत्सन्निहिते वा
आङ्गलवसरे मुद्रितम् कू. भा.
१०. प. एतद्विमर्शाख्यसम्बन्धि पत्रात्मकम् ”
११. बा. बालबोधिनीव्याख्यासहितम् मुद्रितम् ”



॥ श्रीमते श्रीनिवासपरब्रह्मणे नमः ॥

श्रीमन्निगमान्तमहादेशिकानुगृहीतं

ईशावास्योपनिषद्भाष्यम्

श्रीमान् वेङ्कटनाथार्यः कवितार्किकरोत्तरी ।

वेदान्ताचार्यवर्यो मे सन्निधत्तां मदा हृदि ॥



येनायाम्यमिदं सर्वं चेतनाचेतनान्नरम् ।

विशुद्धसद्गुणोऽयं तं वासुदेवमुपासहे ^१ ॥ १ ॥

सर्वेशानः सहजमहिमा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा

सर्वान् दोषान् स्वयमतिपतन् सर्वविधैरुत्पेद्यः ।

कर्माध्यक्षः कटुप्रशमनः कोऽपि मुक्तोपभोग्यः

सिद्धोपायः स्फुरति पुरुषो याजिनां संहिता ते ^२ ॥ २ ॥

^१ ईशायायमिदं सर्वमित्यादि यदनूच्यते ।

दिष्यं प्रति गुरोरेतद्ब्रह्मविद्यानुशासनम् ॥ ३ ॥

१. अत्र प्राधान्येन प्रसिद्धं सर्वान्तरात्मास्वरूपमाचारमुच्यते चेदेति ।
गुणान्तराणां सामान्यतोऽनुबन्धनं विधेति । विशुद्धः देवप्रलयोक्तः सन् परम-
ब्रह्मणः गुणीषो यस्य । तेषां सिद्धेशोऽनुबन्धनमुक्तश्चेति ।

२. मन्वन्तरिगया गुण इव सद्रूपीणः — श्रीरामायणे ब्रह्म-
महिम्न्ये वायुर्ब्रह्ममनोः, सर्वान्ते पश्यन्मनोः, सर्वेशोऽपिगति-
मोऽपिगतेष्वगद्व- मुक्तोऽप्येवगताः नरमादिविषय-
वर्गेषु वायुर्ब्रह्म ।

३. अनुन्तरात्मेन तत्त्वमात्मेशोऽपिगताः ब्रह्म-
स्वरूपान्तरात्मा इति ।

‘संहितोदाहृतं सर्वं विनियोगपृथक्त्वतः’^१।

विद्यार्थं स्यादिति व्यङ्ग्यं निगन्धोऽस्य तदन्ततः ॥ ४ ॥

तत्र प्रथमं अचिद्विकाराधिष्ठितस्य स्वतन्त्रात्मभ्रमादिपरिजिहीर्षया सर्वस्य परमपुरुषायत्तस्वरूपस्थितिप्रवृत्ति^२त्वपभिप्रेत्याह—

ईशा वासमिदं सर्वं यत्किञ्च जगत्यां जगत् ।

इति । इदं तत्तत्प्रमाणसिद्धमीश्वरव्यतिरिक्तं चिदचिदात्मयम् । ईशा ‘ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशनीशा’ वित्यादिषु जीनादत्यन्तविलक्षणतया प्रख्या-
तेन सर्वनिगन्धा पुरुषोत्तमेन । वास्यं^३ व्याप्यमित्यर्थः, सर्वाधारे स्वस्मिन्

1. ‘कर्मणा संहितोक्ताणां विनियोगपृथक्त्वतः’ इति कू. भा. अनुसारी अयं वी समाहृतः पाठः । अन्यत्र सर्वत्र ‘सम्भूतोदाहृतं’ इति । तत्र न कश्चिदर्थो भवति ।

2. “एकस्य तूभयत्वे सयोगपृथक्त्वम्” पू. मी. 4. 3. 5.

‘दग्ना जुहोति’ इति विधानात् दधि होमाद्गमपि । ‘दधेन्द्रियकामस्य जुहुयात्’ इति विध्यन्तरात् फलार्थमपि । तथा संहितोक्तं दर्शपूर्णमासादिकर्म स्वर्गकामो यजेतेत्यादिविधिवत्त्वात् फलार्थमपि, ‘यज्ञेन दानेन विविधयन्ति’ इति विध्यन्तर-
वशात् विद्याद्गमपीति ।

3. ‘.... प्रवृत्तिमभिप्रेत्य’ इति वी. वज्रं सर्वत्र ।

4. वास्यं वासस्यानीकरणार्हम् । व्याप्यमिति पर्यवसितोऽर्थः । यद्वा वसतेरेव कर्मवाचिप्रत्ययेन व्याप्यमिति भवति । न च तस्य अकर्मकत्वमेव । ‘ब्रह्मचर्यं वसन्तं निरभजत्’ इति तैत्तिरीयसंहिताया, ‘त्रिभिर्गामुर्भिर्ब्रह्मचर्यमुत्तमम्’ इति षाठके ‘श्वेतकेतो वषट् ब्रह्मचर्यम्’ इति छान्दोग्ये च ब्रह्मचर्यकर्मकत्वदर्शनात् । तदितरकर्मकत्वं न भवतीति चेन्न ।

‘विश्वकर्मवचः श्रुत्वा ततस्ते राक्षसोत्तमाः ।

सहस्रानुचराभूत्वा गत्वा तामरसन् पुयीम् ॥’ 5. 29

इति देशविशेषकर्मकत्वस्यापि उत्तरभीरामायणे दर्शनात् । ‘आवशन्’ इति पाठेन भाव्यमिति चेन्न । व्याप्यदर्शनात् ।

पुत्रैश्च पौत्रैश्च समन्विता बली ततस्तु लङ्कामवसद्वनेश्वरः ॥ 8. 29.

स्वेन वसनीय' वा । स्मर्यते हि—

‘सर्वेप्राप्तो समस्त च वसत्यनेति वै यत ।

तत स वासुदेवेति विद्वद्भि परिपठ्यते ॥’ इति ।

इत्यामिति' लोकान्तराणामुपलक्षणम् । जगत् स्वरूपतो धर्मतो वाऽन्यथात्वं गच्छत् भोग्यभोक्तृरूपं वस्तुजातम् । अतदात्मकं किञ्चिदपि नास्तीति द्रढयितुं यत्किञ्चेति विशेष्यते ।

‘इन्द्रियाणि मनो बुद्धिः सत्त्वं तेजो बलं धृतिः ।

वासुदेवात्मनान्याहुः क्षेत्रं क्षेत्रज्ञमेव च ॥’

दत्तुपबृंहितम् । ननु ‘रुद्धिर्योगमपहरती'ति' न्यायादीशोऽत्र रद्दस्यात् । सर्वाद्युपपदाभावाच्च' । मेवम् । कारणविषयाकाशप्राणादिशब्दयत्' रुद्धेरिह बाधितत्वात्, 'एको ह वै नारायण आसीन्न प्रह्ला

इत्यत्र तथा पाठान्तरस्यासम्भा यत्वाच्च । आपं तदनुमन्तव्यमिति चेत् छान्दसमिदमुत्तरमनुमन्तव्यमिति ।

1 अयं वी वज्रं सर्वत्र पाठः । 'वासनीय' इति वी पाठस्य मूलं प्रायः 'तेन वास्य निवासनीयम् । व्याप्यमिति भावः' इति कृ. गोष्ठी श्री एषु दृश्यमानं कृ. भा. पाठः । प. 'निवसनायम्' आ. वा. 'वसनीयम्' । एतदुभयपक्षेऽन्यत्र सर्वत्र अनुपपद्यतस्तन्तरे 'वसनीयम्' इति दृश्यते—

‘यद्वा सर्वाधारे स्वस्मिन्नत्र स्वेन वसनीयम्’

इति । इव बहुत्र दर्शनात् वसनीयमित्यस्यैव प्रामाणिकत्वेऽपि श्रीरादिकस्य वमधा तौर्णिच कृत्वा सकमकत्वं सुवचम् ।

2 वगती भूलोच ।

3 रथकाराधिकरणन्यायः । पू. मी. 6-1 12

4 'ई'ग' सर्वस्य जगत् ' 'ए'ग' सर्वे'ग' इत्यादी यथा रुद्धिभञ्जकं सर्वादिपदं समभिधादृतमस्ति तथाऽत्र नास्तीति ।

5 आकाशस्तच्छिन्नात् । न. सू. 1-1-23

अत एव प्राग । न. सू. 1-1 24

नेशानः,' 'अनपहतपाप्माऽहमस्मि नामानि' मे चेही 'त्यादिभिस्मय-
कारणत्वेन धर्मवश्यत्वेन च सम्प्रतिपक्षे रद्रे सर्वात्म्यत्वसर्वाधारत्वादे-
रसम्भवात्, तदुक्तया प्रसिद्धेऽनप्रच्छिन्नैश्वर्ये सर्वेश्वरे यागिनोऽयं शब्दः
प्रत्येतद्व्यः। यद्यपि प्रसिद्धवर्तिदेशाभावादाकाशादिशक्त्यपेक्ष्यम् ;
तथाऽप्यैन्द्रीन्यायात् विरुद्धार्थविषयतयैव रुद्धिभङ्गोपपत्तिः। न चात्र
'सर्वत्वमाधिकारिक' मिति न्यायः। सद्गोचादृष्टेः। प्रगाहेऽथरानेकेभ्यर-
पक्षौ तु प्रैकालिङ्गसर्वेनिर्गहकेभ्यरप्रतिष्ठापक्षे प्रमाणगणे प्रत्युद्धौ। अतः
'पतिं विश्वस्यात्मेभ्यस्म' इत्यादिप्रसिद्धानन्यार्थानैश्वर्यम्' 'योऽसायसौ
पुरुष' इत्यनुवदिष्यमाणम्, ब्रह्मेशानजनकतयाऽनन्यथासिद्धवाक्य-
निर्धारितम्, 'एष सर्वभूतान्तरात्माऽपहतपाप्मा दिव्यो देव एषो
नारायणः' इत्यादिषु सर्वान्तर्यामित्वेन प्रख्यातं, तत एव 'स ब्रह्मा स
शिव' इत्यादिषु विभूतिभूतानां ब्रह्मशिष्येन्द्रादीनां 'विश्वमेतदे पुण्यः'
इत्यत्र विश्वस्येव विशेष्यतयोक्तं नारायणमेव सर्वस्य वास्यमीशं वक्तु-
मुचितमेतद्वाक्यमित्यल्यमन्यरुद्धिप्रसङ्गरहितासमस्तपदाध्ययनानभि-
ज्ञात्रोत्रियचोद्योपालम्भेन'।

एवं मुमुक्षोरीश्वरपारतन्त्र्यबोधमुत्पाद्य वैराग्यभूषितां वृत्ति-
मुपदिशति—

तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथा मा गृधः कस्य सिद्धनम् ॥ १ ॥

इति। तेन जगता भोग्यताध्रमविषयेण त्यक्तेन दोषभूयस्त्वदर्शनात्
परित्यक्तेन उपलक्षितं. सन् भुञ्जीथाः अप्रतिषिद्ध-योगधर्मोपयुक्तदेह-
धारणमात्रौपयिङ्गभोग्यवर्गप्रकरणाभ्यां सिद्धयति। यद्वा सर्वात्म्यत्वेन
प्रवृत्तं निरतिशयभोग्यं वक्ष्यमाणोपायमुखेन भुञ्जीथा इति योज्यम्।

1 ता. 'नाम'। 2 पू मी 3-2-2. 3 पू मी 1-2-16

4 अन्यस्मिन् देवतान्तरे रुद्धे प्रसङ्गन रक्षित असमस्त पद—'ईशा' इति।

5 अप्रतिषिद्धमिति पृथक्पदत्वेन पाठो युक्तः।

6. अथ. सामर्थ्यम्। भोगस्य भोग्यवर्गसापेक्षत्वम्। शिष्यस्य मुमुक्षोर्विद्योप-

कस्यापि बन्धोऽवन्धोर्वा धनं मा गृधः माभिकांक्षः^१ । आह च यमः
किङ्करं प्रति 'परमसुहृदि' इत्यारभ्य 'शठमतिरुपयति योऽर्थतृष्णां
पुष्टपपशुर्न स वासुदेवभक्तः' इति । इदं च धनाशाप्रहाणं परमात्मेत-
द्वृत्तविषयवैराग्योपलक्षणम् । स्मर्यते हि—

‘परमात्मनि यो रक्तो विरक्तोऽपरमात्मनि’ इति ॥ १ ॥

एवं विदुषः फलसङ्गकर्तृत्वादित्यायुक्तं नित्यनैमित्तिकरूपं विद्याङ्ग-
भूतं कर्म यावज्जीवमनुष्ठेयमित्याह—

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।

इति । ब्रह्मविदोऽपि यावद्विद्यापूर्तिं जीवनमिष्टं भवतीति ज्ञापनाय
सन्प्रयोगः । शतमिति च प्रायस्विषयम् । शतं समा जीवन् अधिकारा-
नुगुणानि कर्माणि कुर्वीतैव । न कदाचिदपि विद्याङ्गं कर्म परित्यजे-
दित्यर्थः । अस्य वाक्यस्य फलसाधनभूतस्तत्तन्कर्मविषयत्वे विशेष-
हेत्वभावः सूत्रितः, 'नाविशेषा'दिति^१ । अर्थान्तरं च प्रकरणाविरुद्ध-
मनन्तरसूत्रोक्तम् 'स्तुतयेऽनुमतिर्वे'ति^२ । भाष्यम्, 'वाशब्दोऽयधा-
रणार्थः' । ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वमिति विद्याप्रकरणाद्विद्यास्तुतये सर्वदा
कर्मानुष्ठानानुमतिरियम् । विद्यामाहात्म्यात् सर्वदा कर्म कुर्यन्नपि न
लिप्यते कर्मभिरिति हि विद्या स्तुता भवति । वाक्यशेषश्चैतदेव
दर्शयति

एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ १ ॥

युक्तदेहधारणपेशिच च । प्रकरण परविद्याविषयम् । विषयस्येष्टः प्रक्रमेण विषयविष्या
विद्याया अपि प्रक्रान्तत्वात् ।

१. माऽभिकांक्षीरिति युक्तम् । 'मा मा भद्रा नियक्थेन्' इतिवत् स्मोक्तगता-
भावेऽपि क्वचित् लभ्य भवतीति वा । स्मर्यते वा पाठः ।

२. न स. ३-४-१३.

३. न स. ३-४-१४.

इति” । त्वयि ब्रह्मविद्याधिकारिणि एवमेवानुष्ठेयार्थः । इतोऽन्यथा नास्तीति व्यतिरेकेणोक्तं दृढीकारार्थम् । ननु ब्रह्मविदोऽपि कर्मानुष्ठानभावाद्बन्धस्यादित्यत्राह न कर्म लिप्यते नर इति । प्रस्तुते ब्रह्मविदि नरे “अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्याथैव तद्दर्शनात्” इति विनियोगपृथक्त्वन्यायेन कर्म न स्वर्गादिफलहेतुर्भवति । विद्यानुपयुक्तकाम्यानां निषिद्धानां च विरक्तेन विवेकिना न बुद्धिपूर्वोपादानसम्भवः । संभावितानामपि केषांचित् ‘नाविरतो दुश्चरितात्’ इत्यादियलात् स्वानुगुणा निष्कृतिस्स्यात् । तदधिगमाधिरूपे तु प्रामादिकानामेव अश्लेशः परविद्यावतामपि स्थापितः । ज्ञानाग्निदग्धाधिकारो विधिनिषेधानधिकारीति पक्षस्तु न चेद्वित्संमतः ॥ २ ॥

वक्ष्यमाणविद्यायां शीघ्रं प्रवृत्त्यर्थमुक्तप्रकारब्रह्मवेदनविधुरतया वित्तेषणायोगाच्चान्यथाभवद्विज्ञानानुष्ठानैरात्मघातिनां निरयपातोऽवश्यम्भावीत्याह—

असुर्या नाम ते लोका अन्धेन तमसा वृताः ।

तांस्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति ये केचात्महनो जनाः ॥ ३ ॥

इति । असुर्याः ‘असुरस्य स्व’ मिति यत् । आसुरप्रवृत्तीनामनुभाव्या इत्यर्थः । नामेति प्रसिद्धौ । ते नरकसंज्ञिता भीषणतमा लोकाः सन्ति । पुनस्तान् विशिनष्टि—अन्धेन तमसा वृताः, गाढेनान्धकारेण व्याप्ताः । तान् अलोकप्रसङ्गरहितान् । ते स्यात्तमघातिनः । प्रेत्य तद्गतनदेहादुत्क्रम्य । अभिगच्छन्ति कात्स्न्येन निरन्तरं प्राप्नुवन्ति । ये के च

1. ता. ब्रह्मविद्याधिकारिणि ।

2. ब्र. सू. 4-1-16.

3. पू. मी. सू. 4-3-5.

4. ब्र. सू. 4-1-13.

5. पा. 4-1-123.

देवजातीया मनुष्यजातीया वा तथा^१ ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियादयो^२ वा । आत्म
हन 'असत्चेत् स भवति असद्वद्ब्रह्मेति चेद चेत्' इत्याम्नातामसत्कल्पता
स्यात्मान नयन्त । देहपातमुखेन^३ पातवर्गोपलक्षणमिदम् । जना
जनिमन्त ससरन्त इत्यर्थ ॥ ३ ॥

सर्वासासत्त्वेन प्रस्तुतमीश्वरतत्त्व विरुद्धप्रदभिलाषव्यञ्जितेन^४
विचित्रशक्तियोगेन विशदयति—

अनेजदेकं मनसो जयीयः ।

इति । अनेजत् अरुम्पमानम् । एक प्रधानभूतम्, स्वाधीन(न) स्वसमान
द्वितीयरहित वा^५ । मनसो जयीय वेगवत्तरमनसोऽप्यतिशयितजवम् ।

1 अत्र 'तत्रापि' इति पाठ स्वरस । तथा इति पाठेऽपि स एवार्थो
बोध्य । उपरि 'ब्राह्मणा वा क्षत्रियादयो वा' इत्यत्र पाठ श्रेयान् ।

2 सर्वकोशेषु वे भा पाठ एवमेव । कू भा पाठस्तु—प 'तत्रापि ब्राह्मण
क्षत्रियादयो वा' । कृ गोश्री श्री 'तत्रापि ब्राह्मणा वा क्षत्रियादयो वा' । आ वा
'येकेचन देवा मनुष्या ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियादयो वा' ।

3 ननु ब्रह्मज्ञानविरहेण असत्कल्पत्वे ब्रह्मज्ञानफल निशेषसं मा भूत् । नरक
प्राप्तिस्तु कथमित्यत्र "उक्तप्रकारब्रह्मवेदननिधुरतया विक्षेपणयोगाच्च अन्यथाभवद्भि
र्ज्ञानानुष्ठानै" इति अवतारिकायामुक्त मन्त्रारूढ कुर्वन् विशदयति—देहपातमुखेनेति ।
देहस्य पात अविवेकमूलेन विहितानुष्ठाननिषिद्धवजननियमपग्न्यालनश्रद्धावैधुर्येण ज्ञात
तमोगुणप्राचुर्यावस्थारूपमयोग्यत्वम् । एतत्प्रतीतिद्वारा नरकपातहेतुभूतपातवर्गोपलक्षकं
आत्महननवचनमित्यर्थ । आत्महनन परमामज्ञानराहित्येन महापातवकारिण इत्युक्तं
भवति । 'देहपातमुखेन' इति मद्राजकीयताल्पर्यकोशे पाठ ।

4 विरोधाभासेन विचित्रशक्तियोगस्त्वस्तुष्ट्यनिरित्युक्तं भवति ।

5. 'स्वाधीनस्वसमानद्वितीयरहितं वा' इति कृ ता पाठ । अत्र 'स्वाधीन'
इत्येतदनन्वितम् । वी वे क्षी पाठ । 'स्वानधीन' इति । अत्र अन्वये १
क्लेश । तथाऽपि किं तस्य मूलमिति विचित्रिस्ता न निरतने । कू भा पाठऽत्र
बहुधा दृश्यते—

नन्विदं न जायटीति । निष्कम्पत्वं वेगप्रचरत्वं चेति । भैरम् । तात्पर्य-
वृत्त्या सुघटितत्वात् । सर्वस्य स्वेन नित्यव्याप्तत्वाद्देजत् । सर्वदा
मनसो गोचरदेशमतिरम्यं घृत्तेर्मनसो जवीय उपचर्यते । एवमुत्तरेष्वपि
वाक्येषु भाव्यम् ।

नैनद्देवा आप्नुवन् पूर्वमर्पत् ।

प्रागेव सर्वान् प्राप्नुवत् देवा हिरण्यगर्भादयोपि नाप्नुवन् एतावन्त'
कालं न लेभिरे । विभुत्वेन नित्यप्राप्तमपि कर्मप्रतिबद्धज्ञाना क्षेत्रज्ञा
विद्याधिगमात् पूर्वं स्वबुद्ध्या न प्राप्नुवन्तीति न विरोधः । यथोक्त
छान्दोग्ये 'तद्यथा हिरण्यनिधिं निहितमध्येऽत्राशा उपर्युपरि सञ्चरन्तो न
विन्देयुः, एवमेवेमा सर्वा प्रजा अहरहर्गच्छन्त्य एतं ब्रह्मलोकं न
विन्दन्ति, अनृतेन हि प्रत्यूढा ' इति ।

गोधी कृ "एक प्रधानतमम्-शास्त्रविदुषा स्वाधीनस्वम्, समानाधिकद्वितीय
रहितमिति वा । 'न तत्सममथाम्यधिकं दृश्यते' इति श्रुते । परमसाम्यमापन्ना अपि
मुक्ता ब्रह्माधीना एवेति भावः " ।

[कृ	"अशुद्ध	शुद्धम्
	स्व समाना	स्वसमाना

इति शोचनं करोति ।]

आ वा "एक प्रधानतमम् । प्रधानं शास्त्रविदुषामिति रुद्रस्मृते ।
स्वाधिकसमानद्वितीयरहितमिति वा । न तत्सममथाम्यधिकं दृश्यते । परमं ईशाधीना
एवेति भावः " । प "एक प्रधानतमम् । स्वाधानं स्वसमानद्वितीयरहितमिति वा ।
परमसाम्यमापन्ना अपि मुक्ता ब्रह्माधीना एवेति भावः । "

अत्र 'स्वाधीन' इति प्रथमं विलिख्य पश्चात् 'न' कारं प्रकृतं । तेन
'स्वाधीन' इति प्रागेऽभिमतं इति ज्ञायते । इमं नकारमप्रकृत्य अन्ते 'न' इत्यत्र
अनुस्वारं परित्यज्य समस्तपदपाठे वी प्रभृतिपाठस्य मूलमस्तीति प्रत्येवुं शक्यम् ।

। 'नाप्नुव' मिति भूतकालाच्चकानुसंगेन पूर्वं नाप्नुवन्निति भावः कश्चि-
च्छङ्किष्येतिप्रत्याह एतावन्तं कालमिति ।

तद्वायतोऽन्यानत्येति तिष्ठन् ।

‘य पृथिव्या तिष्ठन्’ ‘य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्’ इत्यादिक्रमेण तत्सर्वत्र तिष्ठदेव धाततो गरुडादीनामत्येति । यावद्यावद्वायन्ति जविन तावत् परस्तादपि वर्तत इत्यर्थः । यथोच्यते—

‘वर्षायुतशतेनापि पक्षिराडिव सपतन् ।

नैवान्त कारणस्येयाद्यद्यपि स्यान्मनोजवः’ ॥

इति । अन्येषा क्वचित्तिष्ठता धावदतिगमण नास्तीति चेचित्री । अन्यदपि किञ्चिदाश्चर्यमित्याह—

तस्मिन्नपो मातरिश्वा दधाति ॥ ४ ॥

इति । तस्मिन्नवस्थित अप्रतिगन्धानुगुणकाठिन्यादिरहितोऽपि वायुरपो विभर्ति । सर्वाधारभूतेन सवश्यरेण विधृतः स मातरिश्वा तच्छतघैव पाथः पयोधरनक्षत्रग्रहतारकादिक विभर्तीत्युक्तं भवति । स्मर्यते हि—

‘द्यौः सचन्द्रार्कनक्षत्र ख दिशो भूर्महोदधि ।

वासुदेवस्य धीयण विधृतानि महात्मनः’ ॥ इति ॥ ४ ॥

अनेजदेक मनसो जवीय इत्युक्तमर्थमादरान्मुत्सान्तरेणानुशास्ति—

तदेजति तदु नैजति ।

इति । तत् व्याप्तं तस्य पूर्वोक्तप्रकारेण जवीयस्त्यादिना एजति कम्पते कम्पत इवेत्यर्थः । तदु नैजति तदेव वस्तुवृत्त्या न कम्पते ।

तद्दूरे तद्वन्तिके ।

तद्दूरेऽन्तिरे च वर्तत । मूढप्रतिबुद्धपुण्यभेदापक्षया विभोरेव दूगानिश्च वर्तित्वव्यपदेशः । यथाऽऽह शौनकः—

‘पराद्मुत्पानां गोविन्दे विषयासक्तचेतसाम् ।
 तेषां तत्परम् ब्रह्म दूराद्दूरतरे स्थितम् ॥
 तन्मयत्वेन गोविन्दे ये नरा न्यस्तचेतसः ।
 विषयत्यागिनस्तेषां विज्ञेयं च तदन्तिके ॥’

इति । केचित् पदार्थाः कस्यचिदन्तर्भवन्ति, न वहिः । केचित् वहिर्भवन्ति
 नान्तः । तदुभयव्यावृत्तिमाह—

तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य तदु सर्वस्यास्य बाह्यतः ॥ ५ ॥

इति । तत् सर्वव्याप्तमुक्तं परं ब्रह्म अस्य विचित्रचिदचिद्रूपेण प्रमाण-
 सिद्धस्य सर्वस्य वस्तुनः । अन्तर्भवति अप्रतिघातादविभक्तदेशं वर्तत
 इत्यर्थः । तदेव सर्वस्यास्य बहिरपि भवति परिमितानां पदार्थानां
 भागदेश इवाभाज्येऽपि वर्तत इति यावत् । तदेतद्व्यक्तमुक्तं तैत्तिरीये
 सर्वपरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थं ‘सहस्रशीर्ष’ मित्यनुवाके—

‘यच्च किञ्चिज्जगत्पस्मिन् दृश्यते श्रूयतेऽपि वा ।
 अन्तर्बहिश्च न त्सर्वं व्याप्य नारायणः स्थितः’ इति ॥ ५ ॥

एवं सर्वस्य ब्रह्मान्मकत्वमुक्तम् । अथ तद्वितः सांप्रतिकं प्रयोजनमाह—

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
 सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥ ६ ॥

इति । ब्रह्मविन्माहात्म्ये’ विशेषद्योतनाय तुशब्दः । सर्वाणि भूतानि
 ब्रह्मादिस्थायरान्ताति । अत्रात्मशब्दः सकोचकाभावात् प्रकरणार्थ-
 स्वभावाच्च सर्वान्तरात्मविषयः । पृथिव्यादिभिर्ध्रियमाणपि तन्मुखेन
 परमात्मन्यसिद्धतमित्येवकारामिप्रायः । अनुपश्यति अनुस्यूतं विशदं

निध्यायति । सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानमिति व्याप्तिमात्रपरम् । तस्य तैर्धार्य-
त्वाभावात् । स इति प्रतिनिर्देशोऽध्याहार्यः । ततो न विजुगुप्सते
ब्रह्मात्मकत्वेनानुद्वेष्टेषु सर्वेषु स्यान्मविभूतिन्यायात् कुतश्चिदपि न
विजुगुप्सते, कचिदपि निन्दां न करोतीत्यर्थः ॥ ६ ॥

पुनरपि सर्वस्य ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं सामानाधिकरण्ये द्रढयन्^१ तथाऽनु-
दर्शनस्य सद्यः शोकनिवर्तकत्वमाह—

यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः ।

तत्र को मोहः कश्चोक्त एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥ ७ ॥

इति । यस्मिन् प्रणिधानसमये । विजानतः स्वतन्त्रपरतन्त्ररस्तुमेदं
सम्यगुपदिष्टेन मार्गेण शास्त्रेण विविच्य जानतः । आत्मैव सर्वाणि
भूतान्यभूत् परमात्मैव सर्वविशिष्टः प्रतीत इत्यर्थः । देवोऽहमित्यादिवत्
लोकवेदमर्यादया शरीरात्मभावेन जगद्ब्रह्मसामानाधिकरण्ये सम्भवति
पाधोपचारस्वरूपैक्यादिपक्षा वहिष्कार्याः । तत्र तदा को मोहः
स्वतन्त्रात्मभ्रमादितद्वक्ष्यो मोहो न सम्भवतीत्यर्थः । कः शोकः परवि-
भूतिभूते सर्वसिद्धिममत्वसिद्धया पुत्रमरणराज्यहरणादापि न कश्चि-
च्छोकः स्यादित्यर्थः । यथाह—

‘अनन्तं यत् मे विसं यम्य मे नास्ति किञ्चन ।

मिथिलायां प्रदीप्तायां न मे किञ्चिन् प्रदहाने ॥

इति । एषत्वमनुपश्यतः सर्वविशिष्टैक्यमनुपश्यतः । न त्वयमेव शब्द
एषद्व्यतिरिक्ताभावात् । ‘ईशा वाग्यमिदं गये’ मिर्ताभ्यग्न्याग्नयेन

१. ता ‘द्रढयति’ । भस्मिन् पाठे ‘तथाऽनुद्वेष्टयन्’ इत्यत्र ‘तथा
विश्व’ इति व्याख्येयम् ।

प्रक्रान्तस्य कस्यचित्केनचिदपि बाधाभावत् । सर्वभेदमित्यात्यवेदना-
वेदनयोः कथंचिदपि तादृशैक्योपशदिप्रवृत्तयोगाच्च । न चासौ पर-
स्परविरुद्धानां स्वरूपैक्यप्रतिपादकः, सर्वव्याघातोन्सादने स्वपरमत-
विवेकादिपिष्टवप्रसङ्गात् । विशिष्टैक्यविवक्षा तु सर्वप्रमाणानुगुण्यात्
भाव्यते । ततोऽपि धरमत्र प्रकृतसामानाधिकरण्यनिर्वाहानुगुणसंगन्ध-
विवक्षा । प्रयुज्यते हि संगन्धविशेषक्षविवक्षया राममुग्रीववयोरैक्य-
मित्यादिष्वेकशब्दः ।

एतो च श्लोकौ यद्यपि मुक्तविषयतया नेतुं शक्यौ, तथाऽपि
पूर्वानुगुण्यान्मुमुक्षुप्रशंसार्थत्वमुचितम् । ततश्च वैशद्यातिशयविरक्षया
शास्त्रजन्यज्ञानेन तन्मूलोपासनात्मकज्ञानेन¹ दर्शनवाचोयुक्तिः । समाधि-
विशेषफलभूतस्त्वद्यतनसाक्षात्कार उपायत्वेनाभिहितत्वान्नात्र संशय-
नीयः । मोक्षोपायोपदेशपरेषु सर्वेषु धान्येषु दर्शनशब्द उपासनविषय
इति शारीरकभाष्ये प्रत्यपादि ॥ ७ ॥

पुनरप्येनमीशेशितव्यतत्त्ववेदिनं वेदितव्यविशेषशोधनेन² च
विशिनाष्टि—

स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रणमस्त्राविरं शुद्धमपापविद्धम् ।

कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयंभूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान्व्यदधाच्छा-

ध्वतीभ्यःसमाभ्यः ॥ ८ ॥

इति । सः सर्वभूतान्तरात्मभूतब्रह्मदर्शी पर्यगात् प्राप्नुयात् इत्यर्थः³ ।

1. ... 'ज्ञानेन वा दर्शने ...' इति बी. पाठः । 'शास्त्रजन्यज्ञाने वा
तन्मूलोपासनात्मकज्ञाने वा दर्शनवाचोयुक्तिः' इति भाष्यमिति सम्भाष्यते ।

दर्शनवाचोयुक्तिः दर्शनवाचिदप्रयोगः अनुपश्यत इति ।

2. बी. वे. श्री. 'बोधनेन' ।

3. अप्राप्तत्वेन विधिः कल्पनीय इत्यभिप्रेत्याह प्राप्नुयादित्यर्थ इति ।
'विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते' इत्यत्र प्राप्तिर्भविष्यति । अत्र त्वनुवाद एवास्तु । न विधिः
कल्प्य इत्यभिप्रेत्याह समाधीति ।

‘ब्रह्मविदामोति पर’मिति न्यायात् । समाधिलब्धेनानुभावेन प्राप्तवानिति सिद्धानुवादो वा । ‘अत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते’ इतिवत् । शुक्रम्, अवदातं स्वप्रकाशरूपम् । अकायम् सर्वशरीरकमपि कर्मशरीररहितम् । अत एव अव्रणमस्त्राविरं च । शुद्धम् अनाघ्राताशानादिदोषम् । अपाप-विद्धं अहानादिकार्यकारणभूतपुण्यरूपकर्मनालीढमित्यर्थः । ‘न सुकृतं न दुष्कृत’ मित्यारभ्य ‘सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निवर्तन्ते’ इति हि निगम्यते । एवमशेषहेयप्रत्यनीकः परमात्मा मुमुक्षोः प्राप्यः प्रापक उपास्यश्च स्यात् । स इत्युक्तं ब्रह्मविदं सर्वार्थदर्शित्वेन’ विशिननि—कविः क्रान्तदर्शी । व्यासादिवत् परतत्त्वतद्गुणयोधनानुगुणप्रबन्धनिर्मातेति वाऽर्थः । मनस ईशित्री भुद्धिर्मनीषा तद्धान् मनीषी, अभ्यासवैराग्याभ्यां निगृहीतान्तःकरण इत्यर्थः । परितो भवतीति परिभूः, विद्यान्तरवतः सर्वानतिक्रम्य वर्तते । कामक्रोधलोभादीन् दर्जयानरातीनभिभवतीति वा । स्वयम्भूः वन्यनिरपेक्षसत्ताकः, नित्यात्मस्वरूपदर्शीति यावत् । याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यवद्वधात् परमपुरपार्थतयुपायतद्विरोधिप्रभृतीन् सर्वान् पदार्थान् यथावद्विविच्य हृदयेन धृतवान् । शाश्वतीभ्यः

1. ‘शुक्रं अवकाशप्रदातृरूपम्’ इति ता. श्री.

2 अत्र कू. भा. “एवंरूपः परमात्मा प्राप्यः प्रापकः उपास्यश्च यस्य तं ब्रह्मविदं विशिनष्टि—”

[अत्र ‘उपास्यश्च’ इत्यस्य स्थाने “उपायश्च” इति कू. गोष्ठी]

एतदनुसारेण “उपास्यश्च यस्य तं स इत्युक्तं ब्रह्मविदं” इति वे. भा. पाठं कोट्टियालं स्वामिन इति प्रख्याताः श्रीरङ्गरामानुजमुनयः अभ्यूहन्ते ।

3. एतदनुसारेण कविपदमात्रस्येयमवतारिकेति प्रतीयते । एतदभावे कू. भा. वत् उत्तरार्धस्य कृत्स्नस्यावतारिका भवितुमर्हति । प्रतिविशेषणं सर्वार्थदर्शित्वप्रतीत्युपपादनप्रयासोऽतिक्लिष्टः । श्रीरङ्गरामानुजमुनयस्तु ‘सर्वार्थदर्शित्वादिना’ इति पाठः स्यादिति ।

4. “कविः क्रान्तदर्शनो भवति” इति यास्कः । 12-13.

5. “अभ्यासवैराग्याभ्यां तन्निरोधः” । यो. सू. 1-12.

समाभ्यः यावद्ब्रह्मप्राप्तिं सर्वप्रत्यहृदशमनार्थमिति भावः । यद्वा प्रथमान्तं च द्वितीयान्तं च पञ्जातं ब्रह्मात् परात्मात्मविषयतया व्याख्येयम् । तदा शुभमित्यादिकं सर्वोपाधिविनिर्मुक्तपरिशुद्धजीवपरम् । तमपि च सः परमात्मा पर्यगात् परितो व्याप्य स्थितः । अपरित्यादिकं सुगमम् । याथातथ्यत इत्यादि । अर्थान् कार्यपदार्थान् शाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः यावद्विलयमवस्थातुं याथातथ्यतो व्यदधात् न पुनरैन्द्रजालिभ्यः केवलं प्रकाशितवान् ॥ ८ ॥

एवं विचित्रशक्तिपरमात्मविषयां कर्माङ्गिकां विद्यामुपदिद्यानन्तरं केवलकर्मात्रलभ्यन्तः केवलविद्यात्रलभ्यन्तश्च निन्दन् वर्णाश्रमधर्माङ्गु-
गृहीतया विद्ययैव निश्रेयसावाप्तिमाह—

अन्धं तमः प्रविशन्ति येऽविद्यामुपासते ।

इत्यादिना । ये भोगेश्वर्यप्रसक्ता । अविद्यां कर्म, ज्ञानविधुरकर्ममाणम् ।

‘अविद्या कर्मसंज्ञाऽन्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते ।

इति हि स्मर्यते । उपासते एकान्तमनसोऽनुतिष्ठन्तीत्यर्थः । अन्ध अति-
गाढम् तमः अज्ञानम् । त्रिगोभिपङ्गान्नान्तरीयकं तमो वा । केवल
कर्मनिरताना दुःखानुवृत्तिमधीयते चाथर्वणिनाः—

‘प्लुवा ह्येने अदृढा यज्ञरूपा अष्टादशोक्तमवर येषु कर्म ।

एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मूढा जरामृत्यू ते पुनरेवापियन्ति’ ॥

इति ।

ततो भूय इव ते तमो य उ विद्यायां रताः ॥ ९ ॥

कर्ममाणनिष्ठप्राप्त्यादन्धतमसादधिकं तमः स्वाधिसारोचितकर्मपरित्यागेन

विद्यामात्रे रता प्रविशन्ति। इयंशब्दस्तमस इयत्ताया दुर्ग्रहत्य द्योतयति। उकार उत्तरपदेनान्वेतव्य^१ विद्यायामेव रता इति ॥ ९ ॥

किं तर्हि मोक्षसाधनमित्यत्राह—

अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्यायाऽन्यदाहुरविद्याया ।

इति। अत्र व्यत्ययानुशासननात्पञ्चम्यर्थं तृतीया, अन्यशब्दानन्वयात्^१। अन्यदेवाहुः संभवादिति वक्ष्यमाणसारूप्याच्च^२। केवलकर्मण कर्मनिरपेक्षविद्यातश्चान्यन्मोक्षसाधनमित्युक्तं भवति। आहुः पूर्वाचार्या इति शेषः। औचित्यात्^३। उपनिषद् इति वा। पूर्वपूर्वसंप्रदायसिद्धोऽस्माकमयमर्थ इत्याह—

इति शुश्रुम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ १० ॥

१ अन्वेत य अन्विततया क्षेत्राय । ‘वी गतिप्राप्तिप्रजनकात्पसनत्तादनेषु’ इत्यत्र प्रशिष्ट ईधातु असनार्पक सकर्मक इह त थान्त प्रयुक्तं ।

२ कृ मा “यथाश्रुतेऽन्यशब्दानन्वयात्”। एव वा भाष्यम् । ‘अयं शब्देनान्वयात्’ इति चेति भाति ।

३ “अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्याया अन्यदाहुरविद्याया ” इति पञ्चम्यन्ततयैव माध्यन्दिनसंहितापाठाच्चेत्यनुक्तसमुच्चये चकार ।

४ आचार्याद्विदिताया एव विद्याया साक्षिण्यत्वाच्च आचार्यवचनस्यैव एवमादरेणोदाहार्यत्व च ‘आचार्या’ इति शेषपूरणे औचित्यम् । ‘उपनिषद्’ इत्यत्र तु स्वतंत्रवक्तृत्वसम्भारः । उपस्थितत्वंमित्यपि सुवचनमिति श्रीरङ्गरामानुजमुनयः ।

‘औचित्यात्’ इत्येतदुत्तरत्रैनाविवक्षितं पठन्ति “औचित्यादुपनिषद् इति वा” इति ।

५ आहुर्इत्यनेन स्वाभिप्रायं केवलं ते प्राकाशयन्निति न मन्तव्यम् । ते हि तत् न विचक्षिरे विविच्य उपदिशति स्म । व्याख्यातवन्तः । ननु स्वयं स्वातन्त्र्येण निर्णयं कथितवन्तः ।

अत्र कृ ता पाठ ‘सर्वसंप्रदायः’ इति । तथाचेत् ‘धीराणामिति बहुवचनं तात्पर्यं कटाक्षः’ । ‘बहुम्य भूतव्यम्’ इत्येतदनुसारेण विभिन्नसंप्रदायनिष्ठान्

ये पूर्वाचार्याः 'नः' प्रणिपातादिभिः सम्यगुपसन्नानामस्माकम् । तत् मोक्षसाधनम् । विचचक्षिरे विविच्योपादिक्षन् । तेषां धीराणां परमात्मध्यानपराणां वचनमित्यध्याहार्यम् । नटस्य शृणोतीतिउदा कथंचित् पञ्चम्यर्थे पट्टी । इति शुश्रुम एवंप्रकारमश्रौमः । ब्रह्मविद्याया दुख्यगाहत्वेन निश्शेषग्रहणाशक्यत्वाभिप्रायोऽत्र लिङुत्तमः^३ ॥ १० ॥

अन्यदिति संग्रहेणोक्तं विवृणोति—

विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।

इति । यः यथावस्थितोपदेशवान् । विद्यां परमात्मोपात्मनरूपाम् । अविद्यां तदङ्गभूतकर्मात्मकां च । एतदुभयं परस्परविरोधप्रसङ्गरहितम् । सह वेद अङ्गाङ्गिनोरनुष्ठेयत्वसाम्यादुभयं सह वेदेत्यविशेषेण वेदनीय-
तोक्तिः । न पुनर्हयोपादेययोः ज्ञातव्यत्वसाम्यात् । पूर्वं विद्याया

बहून् धीरान् प्रणिपत्योपसद्य वयमब्राह्मणम् । सर्वे ते एवमवोचन् । सर्वेभ्यस्तेभ्यो वयमेव श्रोमेति ।

1. 'नः' इति स्वात्मनिर्देशिनः प्रकृताचार्योपनिषेक्ष पूर्वत्वम् । 'मा गृध.' इति सम्बोध्यस्य शिष्यस्य प्राचार्याः इह पूर्वाचार्या इत्युक्ताः । कृ. अत्र 'नः' इति 'अस्माकम्' इति च न दृश्यते ।

2. अस्याहारपक्षे 'अन्याद्विद्यया' इत्येवंरूपमित्यर्थः । पञ्चान्तरे तच्छब्द-
वाच्यं मोक्षसाधनं कर्मकारकम् । तत् एवंप्रकारं त्रैलोक्यविद्यान्यत्वकेवलविद्यान्यत्व-
रूपप्रकारविशिष्टमश्रोमेति ।

3. भूतानयनपरोक्षरूपे लिङ्गार्थत्रये आद्यशोर्द्वयोरत्र नास्ति बाधः । तृतीयस्य तु, अयस्य श्रोतृपरोक्षत्वासम्भवेन बाधात् निश्शेषग्रहणानर्हगिपयवत्वं लक्षणीयमिति-
भावः । 'विचचक्षिरे' इत्यत्रापि इदमभिप्रायवर्णनं सङ्गतमिति भाति ।

निन्दनात्तदोचित्यमिति चेत् तर्हि विद्याया अपि निन्दिततया' हेयद्वय समुच्चयोक्तिप्रसङ्गः । तथा सत्युत्तरवाक्यमपि विधटते—

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ ११ ॥

इति । अयमर्थः—अविद्यया' विद्याङ्गतया चोदितकर्मणा मृत्यु ज्ञान सङ्कोचरूप'मृत्युहेतु' प्राक्तनकर्म । तीर्त्वा निरवशेषमुल्लङ्घ्य । विद्यया पूर्वोक्तपरमात्मानुदर्शनरूपया । अमृतमश्नुते 'एतदमृतमभयमेतद्ब्रह्म' इत्यादिषु सर्वदोषरहितत्वेन प्रतीत परमात्मान-प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः । अत्रामृत शब्दस्य मोक्षपरत्वेऽपि न पुनरुक्तिः । मृत्यु तीत्वत्यस्योपायविरोधितरण परत्वात् । अमृतमश्नुत इति प्राप्तिविरोधिनिवृत्तिलाभोक्ते । अत्र 'अविद्यया मृत्यु प्राप्य स्थित' व्याचाक्षाणा निर्गन्ध पदवाक्यस्वारस्य' उपबृहण च प्रस्मृत्य स्थानविद्यया स्यमेव मृत्यु प्राप्य स्थिता ।

१ अयं धी पाठः । अन्यत्र सर्वत्र 'निन्दिताया' । तत्र 'विद्याया अपि निन्दिताया हेयद्वयसमुच्चयेन तद्विशिष्टा या उक्तिः तत्प्रसङ्गः' इति कथञ्चिद्वचो वाच्यः ।

२ अयं कृ पाठः । अन्यत्र 'अविद्यया' इति नास्ति ।

३ अयं धी पाठः । अन्यत्र 'ज्ञानसङ्कोचरूप' इति पृथक्वादत्वेन ।

४ 'ज्ञानसङ्कोचरूपमृत्युहेतु' इत्यत्र पाठान्तरेण भाष्यमिति भाति । यथाश्रुते अविद्याया संसारलङ्घनहेतुत्वप्रतीते । 'मृत्यु विद्योत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धकभूत पुण्यपापरूप प्राक्तनं कर्म तीर्त्वा निरवशेषमुल्लङ्घ्य' इति कृ भा पाठः ।

श्रीभाष्ये च लघुसिद्धांते—'अविद्यया कर्मणा मृत्यु ज्ञानोत्पत्तिविरोधि प्राचीन कर्म' इति ।

'ज्ञानमिहोपासनात्मकम् । तस्य सङ्कोचः अहरहरावेयातिशयराहित्यम् । तद्वत्स्य मृत्योर्हेतुः । ज्ञानोत्पत्तिविरोध्येव कर्महेतुः ज्ञानानिधत्तिहेतुत्वनोक्त इत्यैकार्थ्यं मेवेति श्रीरङ्गरामानुजमुनयः ।

५ तरति श्रुत्या लङ्घनस्य वाचकः । लक्षणया तु 'व्याकरणतीर्णः' 'वेदान्त तरति' इत्यादौ प्राप्ते । कृत्स्नाध्ययनप्रतिपत्तये द्वि तत्र लङ्घनयाची शब्दो गौणतयैव प्रयुज्यते । न च मृत्पर्यवत्तम्भव लाञ्छनिकाय रिग्रह उचित इति पदस्वारस्यम् ।

व्याकरणवेदान्तादिरूपोपादेयवाचिपदसमभियाहारेण तत्र प्राप्तयथत्वम् । अत्र तु हेयार्थमृत्युपदसमभियाहागत् लङ्घनार्थत्वमेवोचितमिति वाक्यस्वारस्यम् । एव

एतदेव'वाङ्मयमनुसंहितं वेष्णवे पुराणे—

‘इयाज सोऽपि मुग्रहन् यज्ञान् ज्ञानन्यपाश्रय’ ।

ब्रह्मविद्यामधिष्ठाय तर्तुं मृत्युमविद्यया ॥’

इति । इह त्वविद्याशब्द प्रकरणादौचित्याच्च विद्याङ्गकर्मविषय इत्यभापि भाष्यकारेः ‘अत्राविद्याशब्दाभिहित वर्णाश्रमविहित कर्म’ इति, ‘मृत्यु तरणोपायतया प्रतीताऽविद्या विद्येतरद्विहितं कर्म’ इति च । विद्यां पर्युदस्यत्रयमविद्याशब्द क्षत्रियादिविषयाग्राहणशब्दादिवदासन्नतदनन्तरवृत्तिरङ्गकर्मविषय इति भावः । एव

‘तपो विद्या च विप्रस्य निश्श्रेयसकाराणुभौ ।

तपसा कल्मषं हन्ति विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥’

इत्याद्युपबृंहणान्यपि सुसङ्गतानि भवेयुः ।

ये पुनरिह विद्यान्माख्यसाधनद्वयसमुच्चयं मृत्युर्तेरणामृतत्व प्राप्तिरूपसाध्यद्वित्वं च वर्णयन्ति, तेषां कर्मज्ञानयोर्ज्ञाद्विभावं विद्ययैव मृत्युतरणं च व्यक्तं प्रतिपादयद्भिः श्रुतिस्मृतिसूत्रगणैर्यथाभाष्यमुत्तर देयम् । विषम’समुच्चयनादेऽपि यथाभाग’ सन्निपत्योपकारकत्वसम्भवे गत्यन्तरगमनिका नीतिविद्विने सम्मन्यते ॥ ११ ॥

तदेवमुपास्यं परमात्मतत्त्वं साङ्गतदुपासनरूपं च परमहित परम-
पुरुषार्थपर्यन्तमुपदिश्य अनन्तरं त्रिभिः श्लोकैः प्रतिगन्धनिवृत्तिपर-

‘उभय सह’ इत्युभयत्र तात्पर्यं प्रतीयमाने एकत्रानुवादत्वाभ्युपगम स्थित इत्यप्याहारश्च
दायः । एतद्भावे स्वारस्यं स्थितं भवति ।

प्रस्मृत्यं त्रिस्मृत्यं ।

1 किं तदुपबृंहणं यत् प्रस्मृतमित्यत्राह एतदेवेति ।

2 अ भाष्ये द्वि अ लघुसिद्धान्ते ।

3 वैयम्भमज्ञाद्विभावेन । एकमङ्गम् इतरद्वीति ।

4. अयमेव सर्वत्र पाठः । “अद्वयहर्म्याकाशेति शेषे यावत्करीत्या यथाश-
स्पर्षः” इति श्रीरङ्गमानुजमुनयः ।

प्रज्ञानुभयरूपयोः फलपर्यणोः समुचित्यानुसन्धानं विद्याङ्गत्वेनोपादेय-
मित्युच्यते । तत्र प्रथममेकैकमात्रानुसन्धानं निन्दति—

अन्यं तमः प्रविशन्ति येष्वम्भूतिमुपामते ।

ततो भूय इव ते तमो य उ सम्भृत्या रताः ॥ १२ ॥

इति । 'एतमितः प्रेत्याभिसम्भवितास्मि' 'धृत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा
प्रज्ञालोकमभिमम्भयानी'त्यादिषु प्रज्ञातिरूपा सम्भृतिरुक्ता । तां पर्यु-
दस्यन्नयमसम्भृतिशब्दः तदामन्नप्रतिग्रन्थविनाशमभिधत्ते । 'सम्भृति
च विनाशं च' इत्यपि ह्यनन्तरमुच्यते । न चात्रासम्भृतिशब्देन
सम्भृतेऽनुत्पत्तिर्विनाशो वा प्रतिपाद्यः, अमृतप्राप्तिहेतुतयोक्तायाः
संभूतेः प्रागभावास्य प्रपञ्चस्य वा मृत्युनरणहेतुत्वेन वक्तुमयुक्तत्वात् ।
अत्रापि तरतेः प्राप्तिवचनत्वं पूर्ववत् प्रतिक्षेप्यम् ॥ १२ ॥

अन्यदेवाहुः सम्भवादन्यदाहुरसम्भवात् ।

इति शुश्रुम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचचक्षिरे ॥ १३ ॥

इति । अत्र तच्छब्दः समुचित्यानुसन्धेयतया वक्ष्यमाणद्वितयं
पक्षि ॥ १३ ॥

अत्राप्यन्यदित्युक्तं विवृण्वन् विद्याङ्गमुभयानुसन्धानमाह—

सम्भृतिं च विनाशं च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।

इति । तस्यैव फलप्रदर्शनेनानुसन्धेयतां स्थापयति

विनाशेन मृत्युं तीर्त्वा सम्भृत्याऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ १४ ॥

इति । अनुसन्धीयमानेन विनाशेन प्रतिग्रन्धमपोह्य सम्भृत्यानुसन्धीय-
मानया ब्रह्म प्राप्नोति । सम्भृतिविनाशानुसन्धानरूपेऽङ्गे स्तुन्यर्थं यथो-
चितमङ्गिफलनिर्देशः । यद्वा विनाशेन मृत्युं तीर्त्वेति पूर्वोक्तसरूपशब्दे
विरूपाथपरिहाराय विनाशशब्देन मानदम्भादीनां, हिंसास्तेयादीनां

यद्विमुक्तेन्द्रियवृत्तीनां च विनाशो विवक्षितः । अतो विरुद्धनिवृत्ति-
रूपाङ्गसेवनेन समाधिविरोधिपापमपाकृत्य समाधिनिष्पत्तिरूपप्रह-
सम्भूत्या तदेवाश्नुते । अत्र सम्भूतिविनाशशब्दाभ्यां सृष्टिप्रलयादि-
विवक्षया मृत्युतरणा मृतप्रातिरूपफलविभागवचनस्यौचित्यलघोऽपि नोप-
लभ्यते ॥ १४ ॥

अथैवं फलपर्यन्तसाङ्गब्रह्मविधानि^१ एत्यानुसन्धेया मन्त्रा उप-
दिश्यन्ते । तेषु च पूषादिशब्दाः सर्वत्राच्यं^२ परमात्मानुसन्दधतां
तत्तद्देवताप्रणाड्या^३ साक्षाद्वा^४ तत्पर्यन्ता । अत्र हि यमसूर्यादिशब्दाना-
मेन्द्रियपरत्वं स्वरसाङ्गतं तथा सत्येवोपपद्यते । तत्र प्रथमेन मन्त्रेण
पूषशब्दविवक्षितं भगवन्तं प्रति प्रस्तुतां समाधिप्रतिग्रन्थनिवृत्तिं
प्रार्थयते—

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण मत्प्रसापिहितं मुमुक्षुम् ।

तत् त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥ १५ ॥

इति । सत्यशब्दोऽत्र जीवपरः । ‘सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यममवत्’ ‘अथ
नामधेयं सत्यम्य सत्यं प्राणा धै सत्यं तेषामेव सत्यम्’ इत्यादिषु
जीवेऽपि तत्प्रयोगात् । तस्य मुमुक्षुं अनेकेन्द्रियाग्रहम्भतया मुमुक्षुदस्थित
मनः हिरण्मयेन पात्रेणापिहितम् रागात्मकतया हिरण्मयसदृशेन रजो-
मयेन पात्रेण परमात्मविषयवृत्तिप्रतिरोधनेन छादितम् । हृदि निहिते
परमात्मविषये निरुद्धवृत्तिरिति व्यर्थः । रजःशब्दं तमसोऽप्युपलक्षणम् ।
हिरण्मयशब्देन कर्माचीनमोग्यवर्गप्रदर्शनम् । तत् जीवस्य मुमुक्षुस्थानीयं
मनः । पूषन् आधितपोरणस्वभारः । अपावृणु निरस्तपिधानं वृत्तः ।

1. अथ धी पाठः । अन्यत्र ‘साङ्गब्रह्मनिष्ठम्’ इति । अत्र माद्वैतान्वय
द्विष्टः ।

2. सर्वत्राच्यम् ।

3. बीशनुग्नमन्त्रेणादिब्रह्मवृत्तेकन्यायात् । 1-1-32

4. ‘साधन्यविरोधं ज्ञेयिनि’ इति न्यायात् । 1-2-29.

कस्य हेतोः । सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये सत्यस्य जीवस्य धर्मभूताय पूर्वाक्
ब्रह्मानुभवदर्शनायेत्यर्थः ॥ १५ ॥

पुनरपि तथा दृष्ट्या द्रष्टव्यं विशिष्यन् दृष्ट्या गुणमभ्यर्थयते—

पूषन्नेरुषे यम सूर्यं प्राजापत्य व्यूहं रश्मीन् समूहं तेजः ।

यत्ते रूपं कल्याणतमं तत्ते पश्यामि योऽस्मात्सौ पुरुष-

स्तोऽहमस्मि ॥ १६ ॥

इति । एकमेव अद्वितीयातीन्द्रियद्रष्टा । यम सर्वान्तर्यामिन् । सूर्यं स्वभक्त
पुष्पीनां सुष्ठु प्रेरकः । प्राजापत्यं प्रजापतिप्रसूतस्य सर्वस्यान्तर्यामिन् ।
अविवक्षितप्रत्ययार्थो वा प्राजापत्यशब्दः । प्रजानां पत इत्यर्थः । व्यूहं
रश्मीन् समूहं तेजः स्वस्वरूपप्रकाशानोपयिकान्^१ स्वोपग्रहरश्मीन् व्यपोहं
प्रभात्मकं च तेजः समूहीकुरु । यत् आदित्यवर्णमित्यादिप्रसिद्धम्
सबभ्य कल्याणेभ्योऽतिशयितकल्याणं शुभाश्रयभूतं ते दिव्यं रूपं तत्
पश्यामि । अत्र वर्तमानव्यपदेशः उत्तरवाक्यवत् तात्कालिकानुसंधा-
नानुवादः । प्रार्थनाप्रकरणानुरोधे तु व्यत्ययेन पश्येयमिति लिङ्गार्था
“ग्राह्य इत्यपुनरुक्तिस्तदसाधारण्यज्ञापनार्थम् । सदा पश्यामीति वा
निरुपाधिकशेषत्वानुगुणोक्तिः”^३ । अथान्तरात्मनोऽहं ब्रह्मेणानुसंधानमाह

१ ‘एकत्वमनुपश्यतः’ इत्यत्रोक्तब्रह्मानुभवरूपदर्शनाय ।

२ अयं तां पाठः । अयं च ‘प्रकाशानोपयिकान्’ । अत्रानवयः स्फुटः

कृ. भा. ‘भवदीपदिव्यरूपप्रदर्शनानुपयुक्तान् स्वोपग्रहमीन् व्यूहं व्यपोहं विगमयेत्यर्थः’

३ अयं चिह्नितो भागः वी चर्जं सर्वत्र एव पठ्यते । अनन्वयः स्फुटः ।

‘ग्राह्यः । सदा पश्यामीति वा निरुपाधिकशेषत्वानुगुणोक्तिः । त इति
पुनरुक्तिस्तदसाधारण्यज्ञापनार्थम्’ ।

इति पाठो भवितुमर्हतीति भाति ।

वी पुनः ग्राह्यः । ते इत्यस्य पुनरुक्तिस्तदसाधारण्यज्ञापनार्थम् ।

त्वदर्थं सदा पश्यामीति वा निरुपाधिकशेषत्वानुगुणोक्तिः” इति पाठः
निवेशयति । पुनः शोधनिकायाम्—

‘योसावसौ पुरुषः सोऽहमसि’ इति । वीप्साऽत्यादव्यञ्जनार्था । यद्वा

‘योसावतीन्द्रियग्राह्यः सूक्ष्मोव्यक्तस्सनातनः ।

सर्वभूतमयोऽचिन्त्यस्त्र एष स्वयमुद्भूतः ॥’

इत्यादिवाक्यच्छायया यत्तच्छब्दाभ्यामदःशब्दौ विभज्यान्वेतव्यौ ॥
सर्वातीन्द्रियप्रमाणसिद्धत्वद्योतनार्थौ वा । पुरुषः पूर्णत्वपूर्वसत्त्वादि-
गुणक^१ आदित्यवर्णचित्रहविशिष्टस्तर्पेवेदपठितानन्यपरपुरुषसूक्तादि-
प्रसिद्धो महापुरुषः । सोऽहमसि अहंशब्दोऽत्र जीवद्वारा तदन्तरात्म-
पर्यन्तः । अत एवास्मीत्यपि प्रत्यग्रूपस्वविविशिष्टे परमात्मनि विश्राम्यति ।
‘असद्युत्तम’ इत्येतावदेव ह्यनुशिष्टम् । न पुनरसच्छब्दस्य प्रत्यगात्म-
द्वारा परमात्मपर्यन्ततायामुत्तमनिवृत्तिः । एवं तत्त्वमसीत्यादिष्वसि-
शब्दो निर्वाह्यः । तत्रापि ‘युष्मद्युपपदे समानाधिकरणे स्थानिन्यपि
मध्यमः’ इत्येतावदेव हि स्मर्यते । न तु युष्मच्छब्दस्य खाभिमुखचेतन-
द्वारा तदन्तर्यामिपर्यन्तत्वे मध्यमनिवृत्तिः । लोके तु अहं त्वमसि;

“अथरा ‘तत्र वर्तमान-परदेश उत्तरनाक्यवत् तात्कालिकानुवादः ।
सदा पश्यामीति वा निरुपाधिकशेषत्वानुगोक्तिः । प्रार्थनाप्रकर-
णानुरोधे तु ध्यत्ययेन पश्येमिति लिङ्गो ग्राह्यः । ते इत्यस्य
पुनरुक्तिस्तदसाधारण्यज्ञापनार्था’ इति पाठोऽस्तु ।”

इत्याह ।

‘त्वदर्श’ इति तात्त्विकेन पाठेन भवितव्यम् । स छेदनशेषानुवृत्त्या
अन्ते ‘सदा’ इति पठितः स्यात् । तस्मात् ‘सदा’ इत्यस्य स्थाने
‘त्वदर्श’ इति पठित्वा दर्शनमपि त्वदर्शमित्यर्थो ब्रह्म इति
भीरङ्गरामानुजमुनयः ।

1. तात्पर्यचन्द्रिका. 8-22—‘पुरुषशब्दस्य परमात्मनि पुरिशयत्वपूर्णत्व-
पूर्वकद्वागपुरुषानादिभिर्निमित्तैः..’

शाङ्कर गीताभाष्यम् 8-22—‘पुरुषः पुरिषनात् पूर्णत्वाद्वा’ ।

निरुक्तम्—‘पुरुषं पुरिषय इत्याचक्षीमन्’ I. 13.

पुरुष. पुरिषाद् पुरिषाय । ‘पूरयतेर्ना’ II. 3.

सहस्रनामभाष्यम्—‘पुरु बहु सनोति’ ददाति ।

त्वमहमसीत्याद्युपचारेपूद्देश्यानुसारेण मध्यमोत्तमयोर्यवस्था । तद्वदनापि व्यवस्थोपपद्यते । उद्देश्यविषययोरेवान्न युष्मदस्मच्छब्दयोरुपपदत्वेन सूत्रपदाभिप्रेतत्वात् । भाष्ये तु तत्त्वमसिनिरूपणावसरे 'नात्र विशिदुद्दिश्य किमपि विधीयत' इत्युक्तिरप्राप्ताशनिषेधाभिप्राया व्यक्ता, उपसहारत्वोपपादनात् ।

ये पुनस्तत्त्वमसि, सोऽहमसीत्यादिषु कार्यकारणोपाध्याकारविधूननेन निर्विशेषस्वरूपैर्मय वाक्यवेद्यमाहुः, तेषामसिवद्भिरपि खण्डक । श्रोतव्यनुसन्धातरि च युष्मदसदी हि परित्यक्ते । न ह्यसिना कश्चित्प्रतिबोधनीयः, न च कश्चिदस्मिना विशिष्यानुसन्धेयः । विधूनीयोपाधिविषयव्युत्पत्तिमच्छब्दसन्निधिमात्रोपजीवनेन कचिमध्यमोत्तमसम्पत्तिरिति चेत्-ततो वरमपरित्यक्तप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमस्माकं निर्वहणमनुसर्तुम् । सन्मानस्याशिर्नोऽशद्वयविशिष्टताप्रतिपादनं वदतामपि, 'सन्मात्रविवक्षायामत्र वाक्ये त्वमहम्भावायोगात्, त्वताऽहन्ताविशिष्टसदिति विशिष्टविवक्षायामपि प्रथमपुरषोपनिपातप्रसङ्गात्, दृश्योश्च युष्मदसदर्थयोर्मृत्पिण्डाशे मणिक इव घटशरावाकारयो सदशभूतेश्वराकारेऽपि समन्वयायोगात्, त्वमहमर्थयो सत्ताद्याकारस्य नित्यप्रतिपन्नतया विशेषतोऽनिर्देश्यत्वादननुसन्धेयत्वाच्च न कथंचिदपि तत्त्वमसि सोहऽमसीत्यादेर्निर्गृह्य शक्यः । दृष्टिविधिस्तु मोक्षार्थविद्यासु वेदान्तवादिना नाङ्गीक्रियते । यद्यप्यत्र 'त्व राजाऽसि, अह राजाऽसि' इत्यादिवत् तादर्थ्याद्युपचारविवक्षया मध्यमोत्तमयो सामञ्जस्यम् । तथाऽपि लोकवेदयो चेतनपर्यन्तदेवमनुष्यादिव्यवहारन्यायेन जातिगुणशब्दगतिलाभात्तदुपेक्षा । नन्वेव पुरषारयास्वेतरा मसामानाधिकरण्यहेतुः परित्यज्य 'योसावसौ पुरषः सोऽहमसीति परिशुद्धस्वरूप

1 युष्मदसद्व्या सन्मात्रस्य वा विवक्षा, त्वन्ताऽहन्ताविशिष्टस्य सतो वा तद्विशिष्टस्य सदशभूतस्येश्वरस्य वा, त्वमहमर्थयोरेव वा इति चतुर्षां विकल्पमभिप्रेत्य क्रमेण दूषयति सन्मात्रविवक्षायामित्यादिना ।

2 वी 'वेदान्तवेदिना' ।

मात्रानुसन्धानपरमिदं वाक्यमस्तु । मैत्रम् । तत्त्वमसि, त्वं वा अहमस्मि
इत्यादिषु तदनुपपत्तेरत्रापि तत्समानन्यायतया तथैत्राऽनुसन्धानसौ-
चित्यात् । ब्रह्मात्मकोऽहमस्मि इति परविद्याङ्गभूतस्वात्मानुसन्धान-
परत्वेऽपि तच्छब्देन तादर्थीन्यादिकं लक्षणीयं स्यात् ॥ १६ ॥

अनन्तरं तु परिशुद्धात्मस्वरूपमुच्यते—

वायुरनिलममृतम्

इति । विद्यात्मनिनुसारेण तत्र तत्र गन्तव्याद्वायुः । 'निलयनरहितत्वात्
एचिदपि व्यपस्थितत्वाभावाच्चानिलम् । अमृतं म्रियमाणेऽपि देहसंताने
स्वयममृतम् । इदं विजरत्वादीमप्युपलक्षणम् । परिशुद्धजीवविषये
प्रज्ञापतिरास्ये 'विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोक' इत्यादिसहपाठात् । अत्र
'वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चैतदमृतमित्यादिपरामर्शाद्वाय्वादिशब्दानां भूत-
द्वितीयविषयत्वं न शङ्कनीयम् । पूर्वापराभ्यामसङ्गतेः । यद्यप्यर्माणं
परमात्मविषयत्वं विशिष्टवृत्त्या योगतो वा युज्यते, तथाऽपि वरमिह
नश्वरस्य देहस्यानन्तरं वचनात्तद्व्यावृत्तप्रत्यगात्मपरत्वम् । प्राणविष-
यत्वेऽप्यत्र मन्दं प्रयोजनम् । श्वेताश्वतरीयाश्च 'भोग्यभोक्तृनियन्तृणां
विभेचने भोक्तृशब्दविपक्षितप्रत्यगात्मानममृतशब्देनामनन्ति—

‘क्षरं प्रधानममृताक्षरं हरः क्षरात्मानावीशते देव परः’

इति ।

‘क्षरं त्वविद्या एमृतं तु विद्या विद्याऽविद्ये ईशते यस्तु सौन्यः’

इति च ।

एवं प्रत्यगात्मस्वरूपस्य 'न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्' इत्या-
दिप्रसिद्धममृतत्वमभिधाय क्षेत्रज्ञशरीरस्य मृतत्वमप्रत्यक्षमाधीत्याह—

1. प्राज्ञाज्ञासंगम् स्वरूपतो विन्यपरपर्यायनित्यनरहितत्वात् देहादि-
शरीरगमनोपश्रित्येन तत्र क्वचि नित्यमेवावस्थानाभावाच्च' इत्यर्थः । नित्यता
इति हि लोके अदर्शनमुच्यते । अदर्शनमेव च नाशो नित्य इति ।

अनेन नित्यधारणशक्त्यै नित्यनरहितत्वमिति भीरुद्रष्टामानुजमुच्यते ।

2. यै 'भोक्तृभोग्य'

अथेदं भस्मान्तं शरीरम् ।

इति । प्रकृतादर्थार्थान्तरविवक्षयाऽत्राथशब्दः । आत्मोत्क्रमणानन्तर्यार्थो वा । कर्मवश्यकात्स्न्यपरो वा । तथा च स्मर्यते—

‘गङ्गायां सिकृता धारास्तथा वर्पति वासवे ।

शक्या गणयितुं लोके न व्यतीताः पितामहाः ।’

इति । ‘ब्रह्मादिषु प्रलीनेषु’ इत्यादि च । इदमिति विशेषणमीश्वर-शरीरात्वेन नित्यत्वेन च प्रमाणासिद्धानां व्यवच्छेदार्थम् । भस्मान्तमिति संस्कारमात्रव्यञ्जकम् । ‘कीटान्तत्वादेरन्यत्र प्रसिद्धस्योपलक्षणं वा । शरीरशब्दे व्युत्पत्तिनिमित्तानुसारे विशरणस्यभावत्वं गम्यते ।

एवं ‘भोक्ता भोग्यं प्रेरितारं च मत्वे’ति क्रमेण चिदचिद्विवेक-मुक्त्या प्रेरितारं प्रकृतं महत्पुरुषं प्रणवेनोपादत्ते—

ओम्

इति । यथाऽऽमनन्त्याथर्वणाः ‘यः पुनरेतं त्रिमात्रेण ओमित्येतेनैवाक्षरेण परं पुरुषमभिध्यायीत’ इति । उक्तं च योगानुशासने ‘क्लेशकर्मविपाका-शयैरपरामृष्टः पुरुषविशेष ईश्वरः । स पूर्वंपामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छे-दात् । तस्य वाचकः प्रणव’ इति । आह च सर्वज्ञः

‘ओमित्येवं सदा विप्राः पठध्वं ध्यात केशवम्’

इति । स्वयं चागायत्

‘ओमित्येकाक्षरं ब्रह्म व्याहरन् मामनुस्मरन्’ -

इति । एवं सर्वत्र द्रष्टव्यम् ।’

अथ क्रतुरूपिणं भगवन्तं ज्ञानयज्ञगोचरमभिमुक्षीकुर्वन्तदनुग्रहं याचते—

क्रतो स्मर कृतं स्मर

इति । क्रतो क्रत्यात्मकः । यथाह ‘अहं क्रतुरहं यज्ञः इति । ‘यथा-

1. ‘क्रिभिविद्भस्मसंज्ञित’मिति श्रीभागवतप्रसिद्धयनुरोधेनावस्थाविशेष-विरूपष्टोपनिषदमभिप्रेत्याह ऋषेति’ । वी. च्याख्यानम् ।

अतुरस्मिन् लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति' 'स क्रतुं कुर्वीत'
 'एवंक्रतुर्ह' इत्यादिष्विवात्रापि प्रकरणादेव क्रतुशब्द उपासनपरो वा ।
 तद्वोचरे तु भगवति तच्छब्द उपचारात् । स्मर सानुग्रहया बुद्ध्या
 विपर्याकुर । ओहपूर्णं मनसा यन्नः स्मरसि केशवे' तिवत् । उक्तं च
 भगवता 'स्थिते मनसी'त्याह्वय,

‘ततस्तं प्रियमाणं तु काष्ठपाषाणसन्निभम् ।

अहं स्मरामि मद्भक्तं नयामि परमां गतिम्’ ॥

इति । सर्वदा सर्वे साक्षात्कुर्वतः स्मरन्त्यवचनमिह पूर्वकृतप्रत्यवेक्षणाभि
 प्रायम् । कृतं स्मरेत्यत्रापि तथैव त्रिवक्षा । मत्कृतं यत्किञ्चिदनुकूलमनु-
 सन्धाय कृतशस्त्रं मां रक्षेति भावः । एतावदन्तं' त्वत्कृतमानुकूल्यं
 प्रतिसन्धाय त्वमेव शेषपूर्णं कुर्वीति वा । स्मरन्ति हि 'जायमानं हि
 पुरुषम्' इत्यादि । स्वयमप्याह 'तेषां सततयुक्तानां' इत्यादि ।

क्रतो स्मर कृतं स्मर ॥ १७ ॥

इत्यावृत्तिस्कार्थं त्यरातिशयात् ॥ १७ ॥

पुनरप्यग्निशब्दवाच्यं भगवन्तं स्वापेक्षितं प्रापयेत्याह—

अग्ने नय सुपथा राये अस्मान् विद्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान् ।

युयोध्यम्मज्जुहुराणमेनो भूयिष्ठां ते नमउक्तिं विधेम ॥ १८ ॥

(इति ।) अग्ने अग्निशरीरक । 'यस्याग्निः शरीर'मित्यन्तर्यामिग्राहणम् ।
 'साक्षादप्यविरोधे जैमिनि'रिति न्यायादग्रनयनादिगुणयुक्तेति वा । नय
 प्रवर्तयेत्यर्थः । सुपथा गोमनेन मार्गेण । प्रतिषेधस्पर्शरहितेनोपायेनेति
 यावत् । राये विद्यार्थशरीरसंरक्षणान्वदर्चनाद्यनुगुणाय धनाय ।
 विद्यार्थप्रकरणानुगुण्यात् ।

1. यदपि 'एतावन्तम्' इति कृ ता. पाठ तथाऽपि तस्य लिङ्गमेददुष्टत्वात्
 नृ भा अनुपेक्षेन अग्नय निवेशितोऽयमेव एव आशरणीय । 'एतावन्तं'
 'एतावत्' 'एतावन्' 'एतावन्तं काल' इत्यादि पाठेष्वपि भवति ।

2. अयं वी वरं सर्वत्र गतः । तत्र तु 'यदाऽयं प्रकरणानुगुण्यात्' इति

‘अतस्करकरग्राह्यमराजकवशंवदम् ।

अदायादविभागाहं धनमार्जय सुस्थिरम्’ ॥

‘अनन्तं वत मे वित्तम्’ इत्यादिपूक्तमलौकिकं धनमिह विवक्षितम् । एक एव मन्त्रः प्रकरणादिभिर्विशेषितस्ततदनुगुणमर्थं विवक्षतीति सम्यङ्न्यायविदः । अस्मान् त्वदनन्यभावान् अनन्यगतींश्च । विश्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान् । देव अस्मदपेक्षितप्रदानानुरूपविचित्रक्रीडायुक्त । माया वयुनं ज्ञानमिति नैवण्टुकाः । अतो ज्ञानमुरोनोपायविशेषा इह वयुनशब्देन विवक्षिताः । सर्वान् तत्तदधिकारानुगुणान् चतुर्विध-पुरुषार्थोपायान् यथावद्विद्वान् त्वम् अविदुषोऽस्मान् नेतुमर्हसीति भावः । युयोध्यस्सज्जुहुराणम् बन्धनात्मकतया अचिन्त्यप्रकारकौटिल्य-वत्तया वा बाधमानमित्यर्थः । एतः अकृत्यकरणकृत्याकरणादिरूपं त्वदनु-भवादिप्रतिबन्धकम् । अस्मतो युयोधि पृथक्पुरुषं विनाशयेत्यर्थः । भूयिष्ठां ते नमउक्तिं विधेम ‘अनन्यगति’रित्यादि‘गुणैरावृत्तितश्च भूयसीं ‘नमउक्तिं’ ते विदध्मे । व्यत्ययो हि बहुलमनुशिष्टः । नमउक्तेरनु-

पठित्वा “विद्यार्थप्रकरणानुगुण्यदिति पाठो न पेशलः । श्रीकृष्णाराधनाभाष्य इव विद्याप्रकरणानुगुण्यदिति पाठश्चेत् एतत्पूर्वं यदेति वा अलौकिकं वेत्सुगि वाकारो वा निवेश्यः ।” इत्यभिहितम् ।

अत्र कू. भा. “राये विद्यार्थशरीर....घनायेत्यर्थः । अथवा ‘अतस्कर.... सुस्थिरम्’ ‘अनन्तं ...वित्तम्’ इत्यादिपूक्तं --विश्विन्नम् । विद्याप्रकरणानुगुण्यात्” इति ।

लौकिकालौकिकधनविषयतया व्याख्यानद्वयस्यात्र क्रियमाणत्वात् उत्तरवाक्ये कचित् यद्वेत्यादिना केनचित्प्रधान्तरत्वनोधकेन पदेन भाष्यमित्येतदवन्दिष्यम् । ‘विद्यार्थप्रकरणानुगुण्यत्’ इति यथाश्वितमपि तु पूर्वमे हेतुतया सङ्गमयितुं शक्यमिति भाति । ‘विद्यार्थं यत् प्रतिबन्धनिवृत्त्यादि तत्प्रकरणं हेतुत् ‘हिरण्यमेव’ इति मन्त्रा-दारम्भः । तदनुगुण्यात् विद्यार्थशरीरस्मरञ्चानुगुणाय धनायेति वक्तव्यम्, न तु स्वयं पुरुषार्थभूताय घनायेति’ इति ।

1. अत्र ‘अन्यगतित्वादiguणैः’ इति, उत्तराय ‘प्रवन्तुमर्हसी’ति च भवितुमर्ह-तीति श्रीरङ्गरामानुजमुनयः ।

वृत्तिं वा नाथं प्रति नाथते । 'नम इत्येव वादिन' इति हि मुक्तलक्षणा¹
अपि पुरुषा मोक्षधर्मे प्रतिपादिताः । मानसक्रायिकयोर्नमसोरभावेऽपि
नमश्शब्दमात्रेण प्रसक्तुमर्हतीत्युक्तिशब्दाभिप्रायः । एवं परतत्त्वतद्वि-
भूतियोगतदुपासनतद्विद्योपान् संगृह्य संहितेयं समपूर्यत ॥ १८ ॥

व्यक्तान्यक्ते वाजिनां संहितान्ते

व्याख्यामित्थं वाजिवक्त्रप्रसादात् ।

यैश्वामित्रो विश्वमित्रं व्यतानीद्

विद्वच्छात्रप्रीतये वेङ्कटेशः ॥

'अमेदं भोक्तृणामथ च भविनामेव परतां

तथा मेदामेदं जिनमुगतनीतिं च जगति ।

असम्पाद्यां मुक्तिं भवभयमलीकं च पठता-

मसावीशेत्यादिर्न कथमनुवाकः प्रतिभट्टः ॥

1. अत्र कू भा. 'नम इत्येव वादिनः' इति हि मुक्तानामपि लक्षण मोक्षधर्मे
ध्रुतम्' इति । एतदनुरोधेन "नम इत्येव वादिनः" इति हि मुक्तौ नमउत्तिलक्षणा अपि
पुरुषा मोक्षधर्मे प्रतिपादिताः इति पाठेनात्र भुवितुं युक्तमिति भाति ।

2. परतत्त्वतद्विभूतिद्वहः प्रथमतोऽष्टमन्त्रात्मके आदिमप्रकरणे । पश्चात्
तदुपासनस्य तत्पन्तद्वहस्यतद्विद्योपस्य च सद्ब्रह्मः त्रिग्राविद्याविषयसम्भूत्यसंभूतिविषय-
त्रिकद्वयात्मके अनन्तरप्रकरणे । पुनरपि तद्वहस्यसद्ब्रह्मः अनुषन्वेयमन्त्रचतुष्टयात्मके
चरमप्रकरणे । संहितेयं चरमाध्यायरूपा । यदा चत्वारिंशोऽनेन चरमेणाध्यायेन
संगृह्य इयं वाजिसंहिता समपूर्यतेति ।

3. तत्त्वहितपुरुषार्थानामुक्तविधानां अत्र निरूपणात् अन्यादृशान् तान् वदता
सर्वेषां इत्युपनिषत् प्रतिज्ञेत्याह—अमेदमिति । मेदामेदमित्यन्तेन चिद्विषय ईश्वर-
विषयश्च विरपेय उक्तः । जिनमुगतनीतिमिति अचिद्विषयोऽपि । बाह्यार्थानां मिथ्यात्व-
विरुद्धधर्मयोगादिर्हि तथीति । तृतीयपादेन पुरुषार्थविषयो विरपेयः कण्ठ
हितविषयोऽयं तथ्य प्रतिपादितः ॥

इति कविताविष्णुमिहस्य सर्वतन्त्रस्यतन्त्रस्य धीमतेऽङ्गुटनाथस्य

घेदान्ताचार्यस्य वृत्तिषु ईशावास्योपनिषद्भाष्यम् ।

कविताविष्णुमिहाय कल्याणगुणनालिने ।

धीमते वेङ्कटेशाय घेदान्तगुरवे नमः ॥

ISAVĀSYOPANISAD—BHĀSYA

(TRANSLATION)

(*Benedictory verses*)

1 We meditate on Vasudeva possessed of a multitude of pure and excellent qualities, by whom are being dwelt in all this conscient and unconscient ¹

2 The Transcendent Purusa the Lord of all, of innate greatness, the Inner Self of all beings, Himself (eternally) transcending all faults, the One object of all sciences (*vidyas*), the Presiding One of all actions, the Extinguisher of sin, Enjoyable by the freed, the Ready Means, shines at the end of the Samhitā of the Vājins ²

3 (The Vedic passage) which is recited with 'All this is fit to be indwelt by the Lord' in the beginning is the instruction in the knowledge of Brahman given by the Guru to his disciple

4 All (actions) prescribed in the Samhitā could be (utilized) on account of separate injunction, for knowledge, for pointing this out clearly is the addition of this (*anuvāka*) at the end of that (*samhitā*)

1 Verse 1 Anuṣṭubh śloka metre

„ 2 Mandakranta

„ 3 Śloka metre

„ 4 Śloka metre

2 The adjectives used by Śrī Venkaṭanātha in respect of the Purusa mentioned in verse 16 have reference to mantras specified below respectively

(i) Sarveśanaḥ verse 1

(ii) Sahajamahima, verse 4 and 5

(iii) Sarvabhutantaratma, verse 6 and 7

(iv) Sṛvān doṣān svayam atīpatan, verse 8 1st half

(v) Sarva vidyauka vedyah 8th verse 2nd half

(vi) Karmādhyaksah, verse 1 1st half

ISĀ VĀSYAM IDAM SARVAM
YATKIṆCA JAGATYĀM JAGAT
TENA TYAKTENA BHUṆJITHĀ
MĀ GRDHAH KASYASVID DHANAM.

1

*Whatsoever changeable is in this world all this is fit to be
indwelt by the Lord With that (world) renounced enjoy. Goet
not anyone's wealth*

THE BHASYA

There (in the Upanisad) at the outset, for the saka of removing the illusion of independence and others (of the individual) who is the possession of material body, the teacher (keeping in mind this fact) declares the Nature, Existence, and Activity of all things to be under the control of the Lord.

Idam: this, (that is) determined by the respective sources of knowledge as other than Īśvara, of the forms of intelligents and unintelligent.

Īṣā: By the Lord. By the all-controlling Puruṣottama¹ well-known as entirely different from the soul, in (the passages) "The knower and the ignorant the two unborn, the Lord and the nonlord" (*Svet. Up.* I. 9) and others.

vāsyam: Fit to be pervaded is the meaning. Or such as could be made by Himself to dwell in Himself

(vii) Kaluṣaśamanah verse 11 3rd quarter.

(viii) Muktopabhogyah verse 11 4th quarter.

(ix) Ko'pi and siddhopjyah, verse 15 and 16.

1. The meaning of the word is all-destiner. This word has a cross-reference to Bh. Gita. XV. 17, where it is equated with the Lord Īśvara: "But other than these two is the highest Spirit called the Puruṣottama, who enters into three worlds and upbears them.

who is the support of all¹ Thus the Smṛti says "He everywhere (dwells), and in Him everything dwells Because of that is He called (*pariṣpathyate*) by the learned, Vāsudeva" (*Vis P I n*, 12)

jagatyām (is) the significator for other worlds also
jagat The group of things of the form of the enjoyed (*bhogyā*) and enjoyers (souls), which changes into another state in nature and quality (respectively)²

jat-kūṇca This qualification 'whatsoever' is used in order to affirm that there is nothing whatsoever which has not Him as its Self (This is) elucidated (thus) "(They) say that the sense organs, sensorium, buddhi, *sattva*, brilliance, strength, courage, body and soul have Vāsudeva as their self"³

But (the objector says), according to the rule "*Rūdhī* (conventional meaning) overrules the *Yoga* (etymological meaning)", *Īśa* herein mentioned may be Rudra, and further because there is no additional word (*upapada*) such as 'All' (which addition if it were present will affect the *rudhī* and it may then designate Viśnu well known as Sarveśvara)

Not so (we reply) Since as in the case of the words *Akāśa*, *Prāna* and others used in the sense of the (original) cause (where the *rudhī* is annulled), so also

1 That is to say, He is the one being in whom all things dwell because He is their support *āśraya* and *adhāra* and who dwells in all things as their support, as in the examples of the body and the hub of the wheel

2 cf *Bhokta bhogyam prastaranta matra* (*Svet Up I 12*)
Prakṛti modifies its nature and its qualities in evolution, whereas the souls undergo modification only in their *dharmabhūta jnana*

3 Untraced quotation

here the *rūdhī* is annulled,¹ and since the quality of pervading all as well as being the support of all cannot belong to Rudra who is accepted (i) as not being the cause of all things and (ii) as being bound by Karma on the strength of the passages such as "One only Nārāyaṇa was existent, neither Brahma nor Isāna" (*Mahopaniṣad* I) "I am still not free from sin, grant me names (*Śatapata Brāhmāṇa*) this word *Isā* must be accepted etymologically (*yaugika*) as referring to the Lord of all, of unlimited Lordship Who is well-known as possessing those qualities (of all-supportingness and all indwellingness and others)

Though on account of there being no mention (here of *Isā*) as already well known (as the primal cause), there is a difference in this case from that of *Akāśa* and other passages, yet because of its use in a quite contrary sense itself there is justification for the rejection of its conventional (*rudhī*) sense according to *Āndri* principle²

Nor is there here the principle of contextual allness³ (*sarvatoam ādhikarikam*, no such limitation being seen

1 In some scriptural texts all things are declared to have originated from *Ākāśa* *Prāṇa* and others which nominally mean the gross elements, but what is meant by them are not these gross or subtle elements but the primal Indwelling Being in all. This is indicated by the use of the phrase like *vai* or *ha vai* *Yato va imāni bhūtāni, sarvaṇi ha va imāni bhūtāni ākulād eva samutpadyante* (Ch Up I ix 1)

2 *Pur Mīm* III ii 2. There is a *ṛk* mantra addressed to *Indra*. This is directed to be used with reference in *Agni-Gāṇi* *ṛpatya*. This transference of an *Indra* *ṛk* to *Agni* is due to understanding the terms in an etymological sense as otherwise it will be meaningless.

3 *Pur Mīmāṃsā* I ii 1

(If it be said that instead of one perpetual All-lord, we may have one Īśvara stream, one All lord in one cosmic age and another in another age and so on, or else we may have several Īśvaras, rulers, at the same time and at all times eternally, but who divide their absolute lordship between themselves by limiting their power to specific regions, we reply)

But the theories of Īśvara stream and multiple Īśvaras are rejected by a number of (scriptural) sources of right knowledge, which establish the Lord existing at all the three times (past, present and future) and destining all processes

It is therefore right that this passage refers to Narayana alone who has lordship independent (of others) as the Lord who dwells in all (or rather in whom all can dwell) proclaimed in the passages "Him the protector of the world, the Lord of Self" (*Tait Nārd* XI 25) and others, Who is to be redeclared later on as '*Yosāvasau Purush*' (*Īśa* 16), Who is determined as the parent of Brahma and Rudra by passages inexplicable otherwise (*i e*, which cannot apply to any other god) Who is most famous as the all indwelling propeller (in the passages), 'This is the indwelling self of all beings, faultless, dweller in the highest sky, (*divya*), the shining one (*deva*), the One Narayana" (*Sub Up* VII) and others, and Who in the passages 'He is Brahmā' and 'He is Śiva' (*Tait Nara*, XI 26) is mentioned as the substance (*viśeṣya*) of Brahmā, Śiva, Indra and others who are His attributes (*vibhūtis*), as in the case of the world in the passage "This (world) is all Purusa Himself" This is enough (of refutation) of the objections of that person who does not know the pada teaching, the pada (*Īśa*) in which there is no

place at all for the conventional meaning (*anyarudhi*), and which is not a compound word

In this manner having taught the seeker after liberation, the knowledge of (his) dependence on the Lord, he (the teacher) counsels living that has renunciation as its ornament

TENA TYAKTENA BHUNJITHĀH *with that (world) renounced enjoy*

tena with that world which is mistaken as enjoyable,

tyaktena renounced, because of the perception of its (world's) being exceedingly full of faults, being one with that (world) renounced, i.e., (being one that has renounced the world)

bhujjithah enjoy, 'enjoy that group of unprohibited enjoyable (things) which is helpful in supporting the body, which is useful to Yoga' (this) is the import got (*siddhyati*) from the nature of the instruction and from the context (*arthaprakaranābhyaṃ*)

Or else it might be construed thus Enjoy that which has been mentioned as the One in which all dwell, the supremely enjoyable (*niratisaya bhogya*) (Brahman), through the means going to be taught (in the succeeding verses)

kasya svid dhanam anyone's wealth, wealth belonging to a relative or non relative

mā grdhah do not covet And Yama says to his servant beginning with (the verse) "In the supreme friend " "That crooked mind, who is covetous of wealth, that human animal, is not Vasudeva's devotee "

This renunciation of desire for wealth is to be taken to stand for renunciation of all things other than the supreme Self. Thus, does the Smṛti say “(He) who has attachment to the supreme Self and detachment from the non-supreme Self”¹

II (Now the teacher) says that he, who has learnt as taught in the previous verse (*evam viduṣaḥ*) has to perform the routine and occasional (obligatory prescribed) work² characterised by renunciation of attachment to fruits and agency and others throughout (his) life

KURVANNEVEHA KARMĀNI
JĪVĪVĪSET ŚĀTAM SAMĀH
EVAM TVAYI NĀNYATHETO STI
NA KARMA LIPYATE NARE

2

Thus (one) should desire to live a hundred years just performing works. Thus for thee (it) is not otherwise than this. Works do not get smeared over man.

jīvivīset To show that even for the knower of Brahman living till the completion of this knowledge is desirable the desiderative suffix is used here

śātam samāh hundred years has reference to generality (*prayika viśayam*) ‘Living a hundred years one should indeed perform works that accord with one’s fitness. At no time should there be giving up of works subservient to knowledge’ is the meaning. That there is no special reason to say that this passage refers to independent actions which are the means of obtaining fruits, is said in the *Vedānta Sūtra* “No, since there is no speciality” (III, iv 13). Another meaning not contrary to the context (*prakaraṇa*) is also

1 Untraced quotation

2 *Āstha naimittika* duties according to one’s *varṇa* and *āśrama*

mentioned in the next sūtra "For the sake of praise only (there is) permission" (III iv 14) The *Bhāṣya* (of Ramanuja) (runs thus) "The word *vā* (is used) for indicating delimitation (*eva*) Since the context (is) that of knowledge (of Brahman) taught in 'All this (is) fit to be indwelt by the Lord ' for the sake of praising (knowledge), this is the permission for performing works always Because of the power (*māhatyma*) of knowledge, even one is performing works always, one is not stained by them in this manner knowledge is praised And the rest of the passage, "Thus for thee, it is not otherwise than this works do not get smeared over man" shows this alone

tvayi for thee, who are fit for Brahma vidya

evam Thus alone is the thing (that is) to be practised,

Iti'nyatha nāsti (It) is not otherwise than this this is said negatively for the sake of confirming (the previous positive statement regarding doing works which are imperative throughout life)

Now (if it be asked) will there not accrue bondage to the knower of Brahman, since there is the performing of work, (the teacher) says Works do not get smeared over man In the case of the man, the Brahman knower, under reference according to the "principle of separate injunction" (as taught in the sūtra) "But Agnihotra and others (are to be performed) for that purpose (of knowledge) alone, since that is (so) seen (in the Upanisads)" (IV i 16), actions do not become the causes of results such as *svarga* and others There is no possibility of a discriminating desireless man wittingly undertaking to do works as means to pleasures which are not useful for knowledge and to forbidden works For (such of) those that

may arise there will be the expiation (niskṛti) according to his fitness, on the strength of the text: "If one is not free from bad conduct.... (one will not attain Brahman)" (*Katha-Up.* II. 24).

If it be said that as taught in the *Tadadhigamādhi-karana* (V.S. IV. i. 13), Brahma-Vidyā is so powerful as to prevent any works from staining man, and therefore no expiation is needed, (we reply) but what is established in the case of those who practise Brahma-vidyā is that the only sins which do not stain them are those which are performed inattentively (*pramādikānām*).

That he whose fitness (*adhikāra*) has been burnt by the fire of knowledge is not subject to the injunctions, mandatory and prohibitive, is a view that is not acceptable to the knowers of the Veda.

III. For the sake of making one quickly take to the knowledge (hereinafter) to be imparted, he (the teacher) now says that falling into Naraka most assuredly happens to those who commit self murder, because their knowledge and actions become other than what they ought to be, due to their lacking the knowledge of the said nature and because of having desires for wealth :

ASURYĀ NĀMA TE LOKĀ
ANDHENA TAMASĀVRTĀH
TĀNS TE PRETYĀBHIGACCHANTI
YE KECĀTMAHANO JANĀH

3

(There are) Those worlds known as asura permeated by Blinding darkness whitherto the soul-slayers, whoever they are resort on departing (from their bodies).

Asuryā : (the suffix) ण (is used) in the sense of 'Those which belong to the Asuras; 'endurable by those of asuric nature' is the meaning.'

nāma the term of notoreity

te lokāḥ there exist most frightening worlds
named Naraka He further describes them thus

andhena tamasavrlah permeated by intense darkness¹

tan them, bereft of all light

te those self slayers

pretya on departing from (their) then bodies

abhigacchanti completely continuously attain

je ke ca any, divine or human (being), such as
brahmans or ksatriyas and others

atmahanah the soul slayers, (that is) those who
make themselves as if non existent, as said in the
Upanisad "If one knows not Brahman, verily one
becomes non existent" (*Tait Up* VI 1) This
through the destruction of the self (*deha ghātamukhena*),
indicates the series of great sins (*pataka-varga*)²

janah those who take births—'those who are in
samsara' is the meaning

IV The Ruler-principle (Īśvara tattvam) spoken
of in a previous verse (*Īśa* I) as the All supporter, is
clearly described as having wonderful powers which
are suggested by contradictory terms as it were, thus

ANĒJAD EKAM MANASO JAVĪṆO

NAINAD DEVĀ APNUVAN PŪRVAMARṢAT

TAD DHĀVATO NYĀNATYETI TIṢṬHAT

TASMINNĀPO MĀTARIŚVĀ DADHĀTI

4

1 cf The use of the same phrase used by the seer in verses
Īśa 9 and 12

2 The Government Oriental Miss Library Miss D 31 read
यत्सतमुत्तेन पाद्वर्गो ह्यमिदम् G O Miss Lib Miss R
3192 (c)
देहपतमुत्तेन पाद्वर्गो ह्यमिदम्

The one unmoving (yet) speedier than the mind

That (which has) already obtained (all) the gods have not yet attained

That standing overtakes others that run

By that, air (Matarisvan) upbears the waters

Anejat unmoving

ekam The one, transcendent (*pradhunam*), or that which has no second being outside His controlling power or equal to Him

manaso jatyah Having a speed greater than even the speediest mind

If it be said, that unmovingness and such speediness cannot co exist, (we reply) Not so, because by recourse to intention (*tātparyā*) they can easily co exist. Since all are always pervaded by Him there is unmovingness, and since He exists beyond the range of the mind's perception at all times. He is stated to be faster than the mind as it were¹. In the following passages also, (it) has to be construed thus.

Na etad devā apnuvan purvam arsat This (which has) already obtained (all), all the gods have not yet attained

devah gods, Hiranyagarbha (Brahma) and others

na apnuvan Have not all this time attained. The embodied souls (*ksetrajñas*) whose consciousness is obstructed by karma prior to their gaining that knowledge, do not attain it by their own intelligence, though it is infinite and therefore eternally omnipervasive. Therefore there is no contradiction here.

¹ To move' means to reach a space in which it was not before. But for a thing which is all pervasive there cannot be a space in which it was not before. Therefore it is motionless.

Thus is it said in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (VIII. iii. 2).

“So just as those who do not know the spot might go over a hid treasure of gold again and again but not find it, even so, all creatures here go day by day to that Brahman-world (*Brahmaloka*) (in deep sleep) but do not find it, for truly they are carried astray by what is false.”¹

Tad dhāvato’nyān atyeti tiṣṭhat: As stated in the passages “He who is in the earth”. “(He) who is in the self” (*Bṛh. Up.* V. vii. 7ff), in this manner even whilst remaining in everything. It overtakes the running Garuda and others. “However far and far they may run It is beyond that” is the meaning.

Thus it has been said :

“Even flying like Garuḍa for 1,000,000 years, one, though having the speed of the mind, even then cannot reach the limit of the Cause.”²

The overtaking of those who run by those who are at any one place is not possible: This is (a case of) wonder.

That there is something more wonderful is mentioned (next): *Tasmīnnaṣo mātarīṣvā dadhātī*: By It (supported), the air upbears the waters. The air which is in It, though void of hardness and others to enable it to prevent water (in the form of cloud) (from falling), upbears water. That is to say, air being supported by the supreme Lord, the supporter of all, verily through His power supports water, clouds, stars planets, starry bodies and others. Thus the *Smṛti* says “Heaven, *Ākāśa* with the Moon, Sun, stars, the

1. Trans. from Hume : *Thirteen Principal Upanisads*.

2. Ahir, Sam.

directions, earth, the great ocean, are being supported by the power of the great self, Vasudeva " (*Mh Bh Anu* 154, 136)

V Out of regard (for the subject matter, *īśvara*) (the teacher) in a different way teaches what has been said (in the previous verse) as "The one, unmoving, speedier than the mind" thus

TAD EJATI TAD U NAJATI
TAD DŪRE TADVANTIKE
TADANTARASYA SARVASYA
TAD U SARVASYĀSIA BĀHYATAH

5

That moves and that truly does not move

That is afar and that is also near

That is inside all this that verily is outside all this

Tat that, the pervading principle

ejati, moves through being faster than the mind after the manner spoken of in the previous (verse) 'Moves as it were' is the meaning

Tad u na ejati that same thing verily does not move

Tad dure tadu antike that is afar and also near Having in view the difference between the ignorant and the awakened, even the Infinite (*Brahman*) is described as far and is near Thus does Śaṅkara say 'To those whose faces are turned away from Govinda, whose minds are attached to objects (of senses), to them, that Supreme Brahman is further than the far, to those whose minds are absorbed in Govinda, having renounced all objects one should know, that is near' (*Is Dharma* 99-14)

A thing can exist within something, but, at the same time, it cannot be outside it A thing can be outside but not within it (also) Here he mentions

the distinction (of *Īśvara*) from both these (kinds of things) ‘That (is) inside all this (and) that truly (is) outside all this’

tat that, the transcendent omnipervasive Brahman spoken of already

asya sarvasya of all things having variegated conscient and unconscient forms and determined by sources of right knowledge

antar bhavati dwells within, ‘because there is no obstruction it exists without there being any limitation of space’ is the meaning That same thing exists also outside all these, that is, that exists both at places where finite objects are and at places where they are not That is clearly declared in the *Taittirīya* beginning with the “Thousand headed” the purpose of which is to determine that principle which has to be meditated upon in all the several sciences of the Transcendent (*para vidyā*) thus

“Whatever is in the world, seen or even heard, pervading all that both inside and outside Narayana stands’ (*Tait Nara* A 1) ¹

VI Thus has been said that all things have Brahman as their self Next is mentioned the immediate utility of having this knowledge

YASTU SARVĀNI BHUTĀNI
ATMANĪ EVĀNUPAŚYATI
SARVABHŪTESU CĀTMANAM
TATO NA VIJUGUṢSATE

6

(He) who sees all creatures in the self alone and the Self in all creatures does not recoil from anything

¹ cf Śatapatha Brāh XIV 5 30 cf B Gītā VI 29-30

yastu But who *tu* is used for the sake of indicating the extra-ordinariness with regard to the greatness (*mahima*) of the knower of Brahman

sarvāṇi bhūtāni all creatures, from Brahmā down to the plants

Ātmanī In the Self Here the word 'self' refers to the all indwelling self because there is nothing to indicate limitation, and because of the context, and because of the nature of the thing (*arthasvabhāvat*) (described)

eva alone The intention of the word 'alone' is, that even those things that are supported by the earth and others really reside in the supreme Lord *through* these elements

anupaśyati continuously clearly perceives

sarvabhūtesu ca ātmanam by these words is intended pervasion alone, since they are incapable of supporting Him (lit there can be no support to Him by them)

(*sah*) 'He', the correlative of 'who', has to be inserted

tataḥ na vyugupsate All things having been perceived as having Brahman as their self, from none of them does he recoil, in the same way as he does not recoil from his own dependents The meaning is, he scorns nothing

VII Once again, strengthening (the above teaching) by means of (the statement of) co-ordination, (he, the teacher) says that to perceive it thus leads to the immediate annihilation of sorrow

YASMIN SARVĀNI BHŪTĀNI
 ĀTMĀN ABHŪD VIJANATAH
 TATRA KO MOHAN KĀŚČOKA
 EKĀTVAM ANUPAŚYATAH

When for him who knows the self alone has become all creatures.

Then for him perceiving oneness, where is there delusion or sorrow?

jasmin * when, at the time of meditation

viyānataḥ for him who knows distinctly by the method well taught (*upadistena margena*) the difference between the independent and the dependent entities with the help of the scriptures

ātmā eva sarvānī bhūtāni abhūt 'The supreme Self itself has appeared as qualified by all' is the meaning. When the co ordination between the world and Brahman is possible through the principle of relationship of body and soul according to common and scriptural usage as in 'I am a God' etc., the theories of *bādha*¹ (sublation), *upacāra*² (secondary significance) and *svarūpaikyā*³ (identity in nature) are to be rejected ⁴

- 1 *Badha* theory of *samānadhikarānya* negates one of the terms as false. In the example 'the thief is this pillar' the meaning is that there is no thief at all but that the pillar was mistaken for the thief. The identity expressed by 'is' negates the thief by affirming the pillar as the real. In this kind of identity then the world which appears as existing perceptibly has to be negated.
- 2 *Upacāra* (identity through secondary meaning), 'All this is the King', this means that all these are entirely dependent on the king. Though there is here a statement of identity conveyed again by the word 'is' it is only by recourse to secondary meaning we are enabled to make sense out of that statement. "All this is verily the Brahman" (*sarvam khalvidam Brahma*) though it can be understood in this secondary way, yet it does not fully explain the implicit relation of identity.
- 3 The substance-identity (*svarūpaikyā*) "The mud is the pot" is a statement of the oneness of substance between mud and pot. This kind of identity is not capable of being applied here since if there be *svarūpa* identity between the world and Brahman (i) Brahman would have to undergo change, and (ii) the relationship between two incompatible substances as matter and spirit is impossible.
- 4 The fourth kind of co-ordination is based on the Śaṅkara-Saṁhita of Viśiṣṭadvaita.

tatra Then

kah mohah where is there delusion? Delusion of the form of wrong notion of self independence and others does not happen This is the meaning

kah śokah Where is there sorrow? There will arise no grief, even where there are deaths of children or the seizing away of kingdoms and others, because of the realization of the absence of ownership in all things which belong to the Transcendent this is the meaning Thus (Janaka) says "Infinite indeed is my wealth of which nothing is mine If Mithila is burnt nothing mine is burnt" (*Mh Bh* śanti XVII 18)

ekatvam anupatyatah to one who perceives the Oneness of that which has got all existence as its attributes Obviously here the use of the word 'one' does not connote that there are no other things (besides this), because there is nothing to militate against anything said at the beginning in "All this is fit for the indwelling by the Lord" (*Ita* I) as pervaded by the Lord, and because in both the cases of knowing and non knowing that all differences are illusory, the teacher could not have given this kind of instruction and others regarding such identity

Nor does this (*eka*) speak of the substance-identity (*śarupakya*) of the mutually incompatible factors, because in case there is the destruction of all contradictions, there will occur confusion in the discrimination and others between one's own theory and those of others The explanation of the 'oneness' as belonging to Brahman with its attributes can be entertained, since it is in accord with all the sources of right knowledge But it is better to take it to mean the

relation (of body and soul, *śarīra śarīri-bhāvā*)¹ which enables us to maintain the co-ordination stated above, because the term (*ekatvam*) oneness is used in the passage "The oneness of Rāma and Sugrīva (*Ramāyana Sund* 35 51) and others, so as to mean some particular relation ²

Even though these two verses may be construed so as to refer to the released soul, it is more appropriate (to say), in consonance with what has been said, that it means praise of the seeker (*mumukṣu*). Consequently, the word 'seeing' *anupaśyatah* is applied to such knowledge arising out of a study of scriptures or to that knowledge of meditation on the Highest) which arises through such study, in order to indicate its state when it becomes most clear and distinct. It cannot be doubted that the intuitive vision which results here as a fruit of the particular *samādhi* is that which is meant, since it is mentioned as the means (of liberation). It has been affirmed in the *Śrī Bhāṣya* that the word 'seeing' refers in all those passages

1 According to Viśiṣṭādvaita the co-ordination is explained in the following manner 'I am a god' (*Devo'ham*) means that the *deva* (god) is the body (form or *jati*) and 'I' is the self which owns it or dwells in it or controls it. That which refers to the body really refers to the self within it is the inseparable relation between the body and the self that is stated. When either of the terms is mentioned it means that implicitly the other also is intimated.

2 The *samanādhikaranyā* between the world and the Brahman is one of the body and self. Friendship *sneha* or love is also another instance of *sāmanādhikaranyā*. When we speak of the unity or oneness of Rāma and Sugrīva, it is not substantial identity that is intimated but oneness of love or reciprocal existence. Dependence on the Lord and living for the Lord are types of co-ordination giving rise to the expressions of oneness or identity, or unity.

which counsel the means to realization to the meditation-knowledge (*ūpāsana-jñāna*).

VIII. And again the teacher describes more fully the individual who knows the nature of the Ruler and the Ruled, by clearly¹ pointing out the special qualities of that, which he has to know :

SA PARYAGĀC CHUKRAM AKĀYAM AVRANAM
ASNĀVIRAM ŚUDDHAM APĀPAVIDDHAM
KAVIR MANISĪ PARIBHŪH SVAYAMBHŪR
YĀTHATATHVATORTHAN VYADADHĀC
CHĀSVATIBHYAH SAMĀBHĪYAH 8

He attains the radiant, bodiless, soreless, sinewless, pure, uninjured by sin. (he) seer, controllers of the mind, conqueror, independent, bears (in his mind) the real nature of things for innumerable years

Sah : He who sees Brahman the indwelling self of all beings.

paryagāt : 'will attain' is the meaning, according to the principle enunciated in the text "He who knows Brahman attains the Transcendent (*param*)" (*Tait Anand.* I. i.). Or else it is restatement of the fact that he has attained experience (*anubhava*) obtained by *samādhi* as in the case (of the text) "One attains Brahman here (itself)" (*Katha Up.* II. iv. 14).

śukram : pure, of the self-luminous form.

akāyam : though having all as His body, yet free from any karmic body.

Therefore having no scars or muscles (*avranam asnāvīram*).

1. Texts and Mss. give two types of readings : Govt. O.M.L. Miss. D. 319 and R. : 192 & SVOI Mss. read घोषनेन.

Anandaress ed. reads घोषनेन.

Navanitām Krishṇamachariar's ed reads घोषनेन.

suddham : not even smelling of ignorance and other faults

apāpaviddham : "That which is unaffected by karmas which are of the form of good and evil (*pāpa-punya*) which are the causes of ignorance and others," this is the meaning, since the Upanisad beginning with the passage "Neither good actions (affect Him)" closes with the word "All sin from Him recedes" (*Ch. Up. VIII. iv. 1*).

In this manner, the Supreme Self who is absolutely proof against evil (*hejagūnas*) is the One Who is to be attained, and Who leads one to the attainment, and Who is to be meditated upon by the seeker (*mumūksu*).¹

The teacher describes the knower of Brahman as the "seer of all things".

kavīh : He who sees things transcending (all the sources of right knowledge) (*krānta-darśī*). Or else the meaning may be 'One who like *Viśva* and others, is the author of works that help teaching the Supreme and His excellences.

manīsī : Buddhi, which controls the mind is called *manīsā*. He who possesses it is the *manīsī*. 'He who through practices of yoga and renunciation has a controlled psychic organism, *antahkarana*' is the meaning.

paribhūh : (He) who is on all sides. He who surpasses all those who know other sciences (*vidyās*).

1. This is the reading according to all the available printed editions. But the commentary of Kūranārāyaṇa suggests the following reading :

दत्तमन्त्रं दत्तं इत्युक्तं

Or he who has subdued the enemies, namely desire, anger, miserliness and others difficult to conquer

svayambhūh (He) whose existence is independent of anything else, that is to say, the seer of the form of the eternal Self

jāthātathyatah arthān vyadadhat has borne in his mind all things by distinguishing them as they are in themselves namely, the supreme goal (*parama puru-sārtha*), the means of attaining it, the obstacles to the attainment and others

śāśvatibhyah samābhyah the intention of this is 'for the sake of getting rid of all obstacles till the Brahman attainment'

Or else, the groups of words in the nominative and the accusative may be commented as referring respectively to the Supreme Self and the individual soul. In which case,

sukram pure and other words refer to the individual soul, which is purified and freed from all limitation (faults and sins) ¹

Him also the Supreme Self (*śah*) surrounding on all sides (*paryagat*) exists

kavīh seer and other terms are easy to understand

arthān created objects

śāśvatibhyah samābhyah in order that they may exist till their destruction

¹ The individual soul is said to be purified when it 'huffles off its karmic body'. When there is no karmic body it is said to be bodiless and therefore it is without sores and muscles which are incident on the karma results, in that state it has no ignorance and other faults. It is then possessed of a body composed of luminous substance

yathatathyatah vyadadhat really created not merely displayed like a magician

IX After having thus given instruction in the knowledge that has works as its accessory regarding the Supreme being who has wonderful powers, then, censuring those who follow mere works and those who follow mere knowledge, (the teacher) teaches the attainment of the highest good resulting only from knowledge strengthened by duties of caste and stage (*varnaśrama*) thus

ANDHAM TAMAH PRAVIŚANTI
YE VIDYĀM UPĀSATE
TATO BHŪYA IVA TE TAMO
YA U VIDYĀYĀM RATĀH

9

Into blinding darkness enter those who are devoted to non knowledge (works) into still greater darkness verily those who are attached to knowledge alone

ye who are attached to enjoyments and powers
avidyam karma works only, divested from knowledge, for it is stated by the Smṛti “There is another power Avidya, having the name karma, which is counted as the third ” (*Viś P VI vii 61*)

upasate perform with one pointed mind this is the meaning

andham very dense

tamah ignorance, or else that darkness of Naraka which is unavoidable on account of strong attachment to the threefold ends (*dharmarthakama*)

The continued experience of misery by those who are attached to mere works is mentioned by the *Atharvanikas* (*Mund Up I 1 18*) thus

“The ships of sacrifice are surely unsteady in which is counselled the inferior karma as being

performed by eighteen agents (or as being taught in the eighteen smrtis).¹ Those ignorant persons who take delight in these as leading to bliss, fall into decay and death again and again.”

tāto bhūya iva te tamo ya u vidyāyām ratāh: Those who are attached to knowledge alone, by neglecting the duties according to their fitness, enter into darkness deeper than the darkness obtained by those doing works alone with one-pointedness of mind.

iva: Here the word ‘*iva*’, like, shows that it is difficult to know the depth of darkness.

u, eva: alone, must be taken along with the succeeding word, thus:

vidyāyām eva ratāh: those who are attached to knowledge alone.

X. What then is the means of liberation? in answer to this (the teacher) declares:

ANYAD EVAHUR VIDYAYĀ

’NYAD ĀHUR AVIDYAYĀ

ITI SUŚRUMA DHĪRĀNĀM

YE NAS TAD VICACAKṢIRE

10

They say (the means of attainment) (is) quite different from knowledge (and) they say (the means of attainment) (is) different from non-knowledge (works). This (statement) have we heard from those seers who explained that clearly to us.

Anyad eva āhuh vidyayā anyad āhuh avidyayā; Here the meaning of the ablative is conveyed by the instrumental case, according to the rule (of grammar) which permits change (of cases etc.,) because (otherwise) there can be no connection with *anya*: different from,

1. cf. *Daśopaniṣad-bhāṣya* of Rāṅgarāmānuja whose interpretation has been followed here.

and because there is similarity with the word in the ablative case in the verse mentioned later (v 13) *anyadevahuh sambhavat* Here what is mentioned is that the means for the attainment of liberation are different from mere karma, and different from knowledge divested from all prescribed works

ahuh say 'previous teachers' has to be added Or else 'the Upanisads', this (later) addition being (more) appropriate (The teacher) says 'This meaning has come down to us from very ancient times traditionally' *Iti śuśrūma dhīrānām ye naś tad vicacāksire*

ye who, the previous teachers

naś to us who have approached (them) by prostrating (ourselves) and others ¹

tad that, (that is the) means to liberation

vicacāksire taught distinctly (clearly)

tesam dhīrānām of those seers, who are attached to meditation on the Supreme Self Here 'statement' (*vacanam*) has to be added (to complete the sense) Or else, as in the passage 'One hears of the dancer' which means 'Hears from the dancer' the genitive can *somehow* be made to mean the ablative

Iti śuśrūma Thus have we heard the intention in using the first person perfect is that it is impossible to grasp Brahma-vidyā completely, since it is difficult

XI What has been mentioned briefly as 'different' he now explains thus

VIDYĀŚCAVIDYĀNCA
YAS TAD VEDOBHAYAM SAHA
AVIDYAYĀ MṚTYUM TIRTVĀ
VIDYAYĀ MṚTAM AŚNUTE

He who knows both knowledge and non-knowledge together

*By non knowledge crossing over death by the knowledge
attains the immortal*

yah (He) who has received the true instruction

vidyam knowledge that which is of the form of
meditation on the Supreme Self

avidyām ca and non-knowledge of the form of
works subsidiary to that (knowledge)

etad ubhayam both these which have no possi-
bility of opposition between each other.

saha veda together knows Because of the
necessity for both the main and the subsidiary being
practised equally (*anastheyatva sāmya*), making no
distinction (such as main and subsidiary) between
them, it is said that they are to be known by the words
“he should know them together”, but not because that
which has to be followed and that which ought to be
rejected are to be *equally* known (*jñātavyatva-sāmyāt*)

If it be said that because at first non-knowledge
has been censured there is appropriateness in that
(*jñātavyatva sāmya*) (then) it follows that there is the
mention of this group of two rejectables, since know-
ledge has also been censured Further if it be so, the
succeeding passage will not fit in (with this view).

avidyayā mṛtyum tīrtvā vidyayā amṛtam aśnute By
non knowledge crossing over death, by knowledge
attains the immortal

avidyāyā • by the non-knowledge (works) prescribed
by the scriptures as the subsidiary of knowledge ¹

mṛtyum death, the past karma that is the cause of death which consists in the construction of knowledge

tīrvā completely crossing over

vidyayā by the knowledge having the form of clear vision of the Supreme Self mentioned earlier (verse 6)

amṛtam aśnute attains the Immortal (He) attains the Supreme Self known as free from all faults in the passage "This is the Immortal, free from fear this is the Brahman" (*Ch Up* IV xv 1) and others this is the meaning

Even in case the word '*amṛtam*' is taken to mean freedom (*mokṣa*) (from death), there is no repetition (here), for crossing over death means the crossing over the obstacles to the means (of realization) (*upaya-virodhi*), and "(He) attains freedom from death" declares the achievement of the disappearance of all obstacles to attainment (*praptivirodhi nivṛtti labhokteḥ*)

Here those who interpret this to mean "One who exists having attained death through ignorance", having forgotten the uncontradicted natural trend of words and passages and *smṛtis*, through their own ignorance, by themselves having attained their death exist ¹

This very passage is kept in mind in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (VI vi 12) (where it is stated)

"He (*Keśidhvaja*), taking refuge in knowledge (arising from a study of scriptures) seeking knowledge of Brahman as fruit, for the sake of crossing over death through non knowledge (works), performed many sacrifices "

¹ The purvapākṣa of this view has not been found

Here it has been said by the Commentator on the *Vedānta Sūtras* (Śrī Rāmanuja) that according to the context and appropriateness the word *avidyā* (non-knowledge) refers to works which are subsidiary to knowledge. “Here the meaning of the word *avidyā* is karma (works) prescribed for varnaśrama” and also “*avidyā* that is known to be the means of crossing over death, other than knowledge, is prescribed works alone (*vihitam karmaiva*)”

The term ‘*avidyā*’ (non-knowledge) which excludes knowledge *vidyā*, having to mean that which is proximate and next to it, like the words *a brāhmaṇa* and others which denote kṣatriyas and others, refers to works which are intimately related (to knowledge), this is the intention. So the *upabrahmaṇas* such as

“Both austerity (*tapas*) and knowledge make for a Brahman’s ultimate happiness (*niśśreyasa*). By *tapas* he destroys his sin, (and) by knowledge he attains the Immortal (*vidyayā amṛtamaśnute*)” (*Manu Smṛti* XII 104) harmonize (with our explanation)

To those who describe that there are mentioned two conjoint means, knowledge and works, and that there are two goals, of the form of the crossing over death and the attainment of immortality,¹ one may accord a reply by referring to numerous śruti, śmṛti and sūtra passages which clearly enunciate the organic relation between action and knowledge as subsidiary and main, (and) the crossing over death through knowledge alone

1 This view of jñāna karma samucchaya is that of the Yādava prakāśa school

In the doctrine of grouping of the unequals, *viśama-samuccaya*¹ also, where the *sannipātya upakaraṇatvam* is plausible according to their respective spheres, to seek any other explanation, is not accepted by the knowers of the rules of interpretation

XII After having thus taught that Supreme Being who should be meditated upon and the Supreme Good (*hita*) which is of the form of the meditation on Him with its subsidiary (*aṅga*) upto the attainment of the Supreme End, it is now said by the three following verses that the combined meditation on the two fruit-steps of the form of getting rid of obstacles and the attainment of Brahman-experience (*Brahmanubhava*)

- 1 *Viśama samuccaya-vada* and *sama samuccaya vada* are the two views regarding the relationship between *karma* and *jñāna*, works and knowledge. The *sama samuccaya vada* holds that works and knowledge have not the Relationship of main and subsidiary, and that both are equally efficient in helping attainment. This view has been refuted because scriptures affirm that knowledge alone can make us attain liberation. The *viśama samuccaya vada* on the other hand affirms that *karma* is subsidiary to knowledge. Both Rāmānuja and Bhaskara accept the *viśama samuccaya vada*. But here arises the question as to how works can help knowledge. The works become subsidiary to knowledge, and can help to create knowledge, that is to say through performance of prescribed duties, knowledge is engendered. Thus it is *sannipātya upakaraṇa* i.e., practically efficient in removing the obstacles to knowledge thus being useful in contributing to knowledge itself as its subsidiary. The other view is one of *arad upakaraṇa* which holds that the subsidiary helps the main at the time of realization of fruits by directly bringing about results which are unseen, *adṛṣṭa*. The second view is that of Bhāskara, whereas the first view is that of Rāmānuja and Venkaṭanātha. Cf APADDEVISED F Edgerton p. 230

should be undertaken as subsidiary to Knowledge. There at first (the teacher) censures the practice of meditation on one only thus :

ANDHAM TAMAH PRAVIŚANTI
YE'SAMBŪTIM UPĀSATE
TATO BHŪYA IVA TE TAMO
YA U SAMBHŪTYĀM RATAH

12

Into Blinding Darkness enter those who are devoted to Asambhūti.

They into still greater darkness who are attached to sambhūti.

sambhūti asambhūti : In the passages "Departing from here I am going to commune with This" (*Ch. Up.* III. xiv. 4) (and) "Having shaken off the body, having fulfilled (all works) (*kṛtātmā*), I shall commune eternally with the Brahman-world" (*Ch. Up.* VIII. xiii. 1) and others, mention is made of *sambhūti* as of the form of attainment of Brahman. The word *asambhūti* excludes it (*sambhūti*), (and) denotes the destruction (*vināśa*) of obstacles, which is proximate to it, since immediately after, is mentioned "*sambhūtiṅca vināśam ca* : communion and destruction"

Here by the word '*asambhūti*' is not meant either the non-origination of communion nor the destruction of it, since it is not correct to declare pre-non existence or consequent non-existence of *sambhūti* which is said to be the means of attainment of Brahman, as the means of crossing over the death.

Here also (the view) that the root 'to cross' means 'to attain' is to be refuted as previously (v. 11).

1. Cf. Venkaṣanītha's *Nyaya-Siddhanta-jivapariśedha* p. 162 (mem ed.) where *upāsana* of *sambhūti* means meditation on the path of the Arcis, etc. *उपनिषद्भक्त्या* ।

ANYADEVĀHUS SAMBHAVĀD
 ANYADĀHUR ASAMBHAVĀT
 ITI SUŚRUMA DHĪRĀNĀM
 YE NAS TAD VICACAKṢIRE

13

*(The Fruit to be kept in mind in meditation is) different
 versely from SAMBHAVA, they say (the fruit to be kept in
 mind in meditation is) different from ASAMBHAVA they say
 This have we heard from the seers who explained that clearly
 to us*

Here the word 'that' (*tad*) indicates the two (fruit-
 steps) which will be declared presently as needing to
 be kept in mind conjointly

SAMBHŪTIM CA VINĀSAM CA
 YAS TAD VEDOBHAYAM SAHA
 VINĀSENA MṚTYUM TIRTVĀ
 SAMBHŪTYA MṚTAM ASNUSTE

14

*He who knows both SAMBHŪTI and VINĀSA together
 by the VINĀSA crossing over death, by the SAMBHŪTI
 attains the IMMORTAL.*

Here also explaining that which has been said by
 the phrase 'different from', (the teacher) now teaches
 the meditation on both *vinasa* and *sambhūti*, which are
 subsidiary to knowledge. He affirms the necessity of
 practising them by revealing their fruits thus by the
vinasa attains the Immortal. By the *vinasa* which is
 meditated upon, destroying the obstacles (to Brahman
 attainment), *sambhūti*, which is meditated upon, one
 attains Brahman. The results of the main (knowledge)
 are stated here in respect of the subsidiary having the
 form of (conjoint) meditation of *sambhūti* and *vinasa*
 for the sake of praising (it). Or else, for the sake of
 avoiding any dissimilar interpretation of the passage
 "By *vinasa* crossing over death" which is similar to
 another passage already uttered (*avidyāya mṛtyum tirtvā*)
 by the *vinasa* is intended the destruction of egoism and

gaudiness and others, cruelty and theft and others, and the activities of the outwardly turned organs (of knowledge) Therefore having got rid of the sins that are opposed to *samadhī*, through the observance of the subsidiary of the form of the disappearance of obstacles, one attains Brahman verily by *Brahma sambhūtī*, which is of the form of perfection of *samadhī*

Here to take *sambhūtī* and *vināśa* to mean original creation (*sṛstī*) and dissolution (*pralaya*), and then to say that here there is distinction between the fruits of the form of crossing over death and the attainment of immortality does not seem in the least to be appropriate

XV Now the following mantras which have to be repeated by one, who is practising in this (prescribed) manner the *Brahma vidyā* along with its subsidiaries until the realisation of fruits, are taught In these (mantras) for those who deem the Supreme Self as the meaning of all (names) the words Pusan and others culminate in that (Self) *through* these respective gods or *directly* For here only if this be so, the fact that Yama, Surya and other words which self evidently indicate one and the same thing, will be correct

There, by the first of these mantras, he prays to Him, the Lord who is meant by the word Pusan (nourisher) for the disappearance of the obstacles to *samadhī* mentioned already as *vināśa* (destruction) thus

HIRANMAYANĀ PITREṆ
SATYASYĀPRITHIVĪ MUKHĀN
TAT TVĀM PŪSAN APĀRṆU
SATYADHARMAJĀ DRSTAYE

The face of truth is covered with a golden vessel That do thou Pusan¹ remove for the sake of perceiving the function of the true (jīva)

satya Here by the word truth (*satya*) is meant the individual soul Since in the passages “(In creation the Supreme Self) became the soul (*satya*) and matter (*anṛtam*) (and yet) continued to be itself (*satya*)” (*Tatt Anand* 6), “Then its name is ‘true of the true’, “The souls are truth, amongst them This is truth” (*ibid*) that word ‘*satya*’ is used to denote the individual soul (*jīva*)

asya mukham its face, by which is meant the *manas* which is like a face on account of its being the support of many sense-organs

Hiranmayena palreṇa apīṭam Hidden by a golden vessel by a vessel full of (*rajas*) passion) which is similar to a golden one, on account of its being full of *raga* (attachment and redness), which obstructs activities relating to the Supreme Self The meaning of the word (hidden) is (the mind) whose activities regarding the Supreme Self, resident in the heart are obstructed The mention of *rajas* (passion also signifies *tamas* (darkness) By the word ‘*hiranmaya*’ (golden) is denoted the group of enjoyable things (*bhogjavarga*) which are dependent on works

tat that, the *manas* which is analogous to the face for the soul

Pusan O Nourisher¹ who have the nature of nourishing those who have taken refuge (in Thee)

apavṛnu Open remove its covering

For what purpose? *satyadharmaya dr̥ṣṭave* for the sake of beholding Brahman, already mentioned, which

is the function (*dharma*) of the individual soul, the *satya* (truth)¹

XVI. Again exhibiting the attributes of that which is to be seen through the Vision, (he, the seeker) prays (to Him, the Lord) to grant him vividness of vision (*dr̥ṣṭyāḥ guṇam*) thus:

PŪSANNEKARSE YAMA SŪRYA PRĀJĀPATYA
 VYŪHA RASMĪN SAMŪHA TEJAH
 YAT TE RŪPAM KALYANATAMAM TAT
 TE PAŚYĀMI
 YO'SAVASOU PURUSAS SO'HAM ASMI 16

O Nourisher : O sole seer ! O controller ! Prompter ! ruler of all born of Prajapati ! Annul the (fierce) rays gather up (thy) light, that which is thy most auspicious form that (form) of thine I behold Who this Person he this I am

Pūsan . O nourisher.

Ekarse : One seer ; the seer without a second, of that which is beyond (the range of) the senses.

Yama : all-indwelling controller.

Sūrya : who urges fully (properly) the minds of the devotees.

Prājāpatya : Thou who art the indwelling Ruler of all creatures born of Prajapati (*Brahmā*) Or else the meaning of the suffix ('*ya*') may be dropped in the word

1. Here *dharma* means two things the first is the ethical 'ought' or the imperative of duty of beholding Brahman, the second is the liberation of the *dharma bhūta jñāna*, the functional consciousness of the individual which due to karma and desires etc, has undergone constriction and limitation and has been even shrouded The second meaning affirms that beholding Brahman is the natural quality of the individual's consciousness In this context however the first meaning seems to be appropriate

‘Prājapātya’ (Then) the meaning is the ruler of all those who are born

vyuha raśmin samuha tejah Annul thy fierce rays which are not helpful in revealing thy true form¹
Gather up (thy) light of the form of rays.

jat which is well known in the passages “Of the hue of the Sun” (*Purusa sūkta*) and others

kalyānatamam of greater auspiciousness than all the auspicious things, which is *subhāṣṭraya* (auspicious enough to be the object of our meditation)²

Te rūpam Thy Divine Form

tat paśyamī That do I behold

Here the present tense, as in the succeeding passage (*so’hamasmi*) is merely the reiteration of the meditation at that particular moment. But if the context of prayer is to be taken into account, here the potential sense is to be accepted ‘May I behold’ (*paśyejam*) according to the rule of change in grammar (*īyatya*)³. Or else, this ‘I behold Him always’ is a statement befitting the nature of the unconditionally dependent soul (*nirupādhika śśatva*)³

Te Thy, the repetition is indicative (of the fact) that this form belongs to Him only (that is special to Him alone)

1 Reading here followed is that of the *Sri Venkateswara Oriental Institute Library*’s Mss स्वस्वरूपप्रकाशनौपयिकान्. Other editions read स्वस्वरूपप्रकाशनौपयिकान्.

2 *subhāṣṭraya* has a special meaning in Viśiṣṭādvaita

3 The readings we have in all Mss and printed texts are so corrupt that some minimum changes had to be effected in the construction and arrangement

अत्र ग्राह्य ! सदा पश्यामि वा निरुपधिकरोदत्यानुगुणोक्ति ! त इति तत्साम्यार्थ्यशापनार्थम् ।

Now he (the teacher) speaks about the meditation on the Inner Self as the I (*aham*) thus

Yah asau puruṣaḥ so'ham aṣmī Who this Person He this I am ¹ The repetition (of *asau* this) is to show great regard (for the Supreme Being) Or else after the manner of the passage,

yo'sāvatindriya grāhyah suksmo'vyaktassanatanah
Sarvabhūta-mayo'cintyas sa eṣa svayam udbabhau

(*Manu Smṛti* 1 7)

“Who this (Being) not graspable by senses, subtle Unmanifest Eternal being in the form of all creatures, Unthinkable, He this shone out Himself”

The two ‘thises’ should be separated and related to Who (*yah*) and to the He (*sah*) (thus *yo'sau puruṣaḥ so'sau aham aṣmī*) ² Or else (the two thises) are intended to indicate that He is proved by all sources of right knowledge authoritative beyond the purview of the senses

Puruṣaḥ Person Who has qualities such as Fullness, Primeval Existence and others Who possesses the form of the colour of the Sun (*adītya*) Who is well-known in the *Puruṣa sūkta* read in all the Vedas which is not devoted to (description of) any other (god)

Sah aham (HE I) Here the word ‘I’ should apply through the individual soul to its indwelling Self

aṣmī am consequently the word ‘am’ also would ultimately refer through the individual soul to the

1 Cf *Madhyandina* recension quoted in the Introduction which clearly shows the insight of Venkaṭanatha into the construction of the passage regarding *yosavasau*

2 This is precisely the arrangement in the *Madhyandina*-recension

Supreme Self, which has his self as its attribute *pratyag rūpa sva viśiṣṭa*)

The rule ordained (in grammar) is only this much "If there be a pronoun in the first person, the inflection of the verb must be in the first person" (*Pāṇini* I iv 107), but not that (the inflection in) the first person will drop out if the *asmad* refers to the Supreme Self through the individual soul. In the same manner, in the passage 'That thou art' and others, the word '*asi*' (art) should be explained. There too, this much alone is said (*smṛyate*) "When the word *yusmad* (you) is used in a correlative sense or even when it is to be understood then the verbal inflection in the second person (follows)" (*Pāṇini* I iv 105), but not that (the inflection in) the second person will drop out if the *yusmad* refer through the individual before him to the Supreme Self (within him)

In ordinary usage the laudatory statements (*upataresu*)¹ 'I am you' and "You are myself" and others, the verbal inflections of the first and second persons are determined according to the subject of the sentence (*uddeśya*). Similarly even here this distinction is legitimate, because those words (*yusmad asmad*) (which refer only to the subject (of any sentence) are meant in the (*Pāṇini*) Sūtras as words going along with (the verbs) (*upapada*). The statement however made in the *Sri Bhasya* (I 1 1) when explaining 'That thou art' Here (in this passage) is not prescribed anything regarding anything, intends the negation of any unknown thing (*apraptaṁśaṁśedhabhīpraya*) this is clear since this (passage) is shown to be a concluding

¹ The word *upacara* means also usage having secondary sense

(passage) And the '*asmī*' (am) cuts down like the *astī*¹ (art) (sword) those who affirm that in the passage 'That Thou art' and 'He I am', the oneness of the Self void of all attributes is to be known by shaking off the causal and effectual limitations, because the words *jusmad* and *asmad* are relinquished in respect of the hearer and the (self) meditator There is none to be taught nor is there any individual particularly meant by the *asmī* (I am)

If it be said that at some places the second person and the first person occur on account of juxtaposition of such words alone as have significance regarding limitations which have to be given up, then, it is preferable to follow our own thesis, according to which the significance of the words is not abandoned

Those who affirm that the text means "that" One Existence alone (*sanmātra*) which is a whole having two parts cannot explain properly the texts "That thou art" and "He I am" and others, (i) because in case (these) texts are taken to indicate, the Pure Existence (*sanmātra*), to speak of 'You' and 'I' in the passages is impossible, (ii) because, if it be said that they indicate the Existence which is qualified by 'You-ness' and 'I-ness', then the verbal inflection must be in the third person (and not in the second and the first persons as we find in the texts), (iii) because it is impossible for the perceivable *drīṣya* objects 'You' and 'I' (*yasmad asmad artha*) to have any connection with the form of *Īśvara* who is a portion of Existence, as (it is impossible) for the pot and the saucer (to have any

1 *astī* means firstly Like the 'Thou art' in "That thou art", secondly the meaning is a play on the word *astī* meaning sword like the sword which injures and annihilates or cuts in twain

connection with the jar made of mud, (iv) and because there is no need to speak about 'you' and 'I' having the form of that Existence specially, they being always perceived (or known) as such and there is no need to meditate on it either. Nor (v) will *drsti vidhi* (the command directing one to meditate upon a thing as if it is another)¹ in respect of sciences of liberation, be accepted by the knower of the Vedānta.²

Though the second and first persons could be justified by taking them in a secondary sense due to their dependence on that (king) as in the passages 'You are a king' 'I am a king' and others, yet it is set aside on account of there being available here the same way by which the words signifying genus and quality (indicate their substrate) (*jāti-guṇaśabda gati labhāt*), as in the case of Vedic and common usage of the words, god, man and others, which ultimately denote the conscient (self within them).

If it be said that one might as well abandon the trouble of explaining this co ordination (of one's own self) with the other who is called (here) the Purusa, (in which case) this passage "Who this Person, He this

1 cf *Mano Brahmehi upasṭhā* etc, *Ch Up* III iv

2 Śrī Vedānta Deśika here proposes and refutes alternative explanation, Firstly Does the passage in question indicate the Pure Existence?

(ii) If not does it intimate the Existence as qualified by 'you' and 'I' portions?

(iii) Or does it mean the Īśvara, who is a part of Pure Existence (as Ādāvaprakāśa holds) having the forms of 'You' and 'I'?

(iv) Or does it mean that 'You' and 'I' are having the attribute of Existence?

(v) Or does it merely instruct the meditation of a thing as if it is another (*drsti vidhi*)?

I am" can mean the meditation (by the individual) of his own purified self only (we reply) not so, because in the (passages) 'That thou art', 'You verily am I' the above view being inappropriate, here also the rule (of interpretation) being the same as that which applies to them (*Tat tvam asi* and *Tvam va aham asmi*) it is appropriate to take this meditation to be of the same kind (as that)

Even should this passage mean that type of meditation upon one's own self, which is subsidiary to the science of Supreme Brahman, such as "Having Brahman as my Self I am", then even the word *sah* (that) which stands for Brahman) will have to be taken in a secondary sense (*laksanīya*) namely, dependence upon that, and others

XVII Then the nature of the purified soul is being described

VĀYUR ANILAM AMṚTAM
ATHEDAM BHASMĀNTAM ŚARĪRAM
OM KRATO SMARA KṚTAM SMARA
KRATO SMARA KṚTAM SMARA

17

Moving about abodeless immortal now this body has its end in ashes om 'O sacrifice' remember Remember that which was done O sacrifice' remember Remember that which was done

Vāyuḥ because of moving about from place to place (*tatra tatra*) according to its knowledge and works, (the soul) is *rayu*

anīlam (abodeless) because of having no permanent resting place and because of not residing at any one place (material body) permanently, it is *anīlam*

amṛtam immortal it is itself immortal though its series of bodies perish This (*amṛtam*) signifies¹

¹ *upalakṣaṇam* means signification of more than what is actually stated by the words there used

absence of old age and others because of the passage "Free from old age, deathless, sorrowless" in the Prajāpati's statement (*Ch Up VIII 1 5*) Here from a consideration of the passages "Air and sky, these are immortal (*amṛtam*)" and others, no doubt need be entertained that the words *rayu* and the other mean the second element¹ since the passage will not harmonize with the prior and consequent (contexts)

Even though it may be appropriate to take these words as referring to the Supreme Being either through extended significance (*viśiṣṭa-utthā*) or through etymological significance (*yoga*), yet it is better to say that these (words) refer to the individual soul which is different from the perishing body, since that is what is spoken of immediately after (this) In case this 'Vayu' is taken here to refer to *prana*, breath, (its) value is very little

Those belonging to the Śvetaśvatara school refer to the soul which is meant by the word 'the enjoyer' when distinguishing between 'The enjoyer, the enjoyable and the Impellor' (*Svet Up I 12*) by the word 'immortal' in (the passage) "Mutable is Pradhāna, Immortal and Immutable is the soul (*Hara*), the one God controls both the mutable and the (immutable) soul" (*Svet Up I 10*) and "Verily the mutable is avidyā, immortal is *vidyā* (soul), He who controls both *avidyā* and *vidyā* is other (than these two)" (*Svet Up V 1*)

In this manner having declared the immortality of the soul well known from such passages as "He, the

1 The second element referred to here is air, which comes from *akāśa* according to Upaniṣad evolution which is the first of five elements This element is not what is meant by the word *rayu* in the Upaniṣad here cf *Taitt Up II 1*

knower is neither born nor dies", (Katha Up I 218) he (the teacher) now declares the inevitable mortality of the soul's body (*ksetrajñā śarīra*) thus *Athedam Bhasmāntam Sarīram*

atha now ¹ The word 'now' is used here so as to introduce a topic different from the previous Or the word '*atha*' means 'immediately after exit of the soul (from its body)' Or it refers to all (souls) subject to karma Thus is said in the *Smṛti*

"The sands in Gangā (and) the streaks of rain when Indra rains can be counted, but it is impossible to count the number of Brahmās who have gone before in the world" and in the passage "when Brahmā and others immerge" ²

īdam this this qualification '*īdam*' (this) is used so as to exclude those (kinds of bodies) which are known from valid sources (*pramāṇa*), as the bodies of *Īśvara* and as eternal

bhasmāntam has its end in ashes This suggests all ways of disposal (*samiskaramātra*) ³ Or else it also

- 1 There are five meanings for the word *atha* according to Amarasimha *riṅgalanantararambhapaśnādīrtśyeṣu* (III 246) Here Venkaṭanātha interprets *atha* in three ways (i) *arambha* (ii) *anantara* (iii) *kārtśya*
- 2 "When Brahmā and others immerge and when the moving and unmoving have perished, the one world soul remains and He is Nārāyaṇa the immutable Reading in the śloka is *yatha* But since it appears inappropriate it has been interpreted as *tathā*
- 3 cf. Śrī T. Vīrarāghavācārya's ed. p. 134 who commenting on this says that it suggests *all sorts* The obvious intention of the comment is that it does not matter what sort of disposal it is since this is the end of the body of a soul in all cases

signifies its end as worms (kitānta, etc.) which are well known at other places ¹

śarīram body When we consider the etymological meaning of the word '*śarīra*,' its nature of being perishable is known

In this manner having said about the distinction between the conscient and the unconscient in the order (seen in the passage "Having meditated upon the enjoyer, the enjoyable and the Impellor" (*Svet Up* I 12), (then) he (the teacher) mentions the Impellor, the Supreme Person in this context, by the pranava *OM*, as those who belong to the Ātharvana School read "Whoever meditates on the Supreme Purusa with the same letter *Om* with three mātras " (*Praśna Up* V 5) In Yoga-system also it is said

"That particular Person who is untouched by sorrow, by actions and their fruits and tendencies is *Isvara*".

"He is the teacher of all those who have lived previously too, because there is no limitation by time (for Him)"

"The word expressing Him is pranava "

(*Yoga Sūtras* I 24 26)

Thus the Omniscient (*sarvajña*, *Śiva*) says "O learned ones ¹ At all times recite thus *OM* and meditate on Kesava " He has Himself sung "Pronouncing repeatedly the Brahman of the form of this single letter *OM* and continuously remembering Me, (he who goes forth abandoning the body attains the highest status) *Bh Gīta* VIII 13)

¹ cf *Bhagavata* quoted by Śrī T Vīraraghavacharya ed
p 154

Thus should one see at all places

Next making God (*Bhagavantam*), who is of the form of sacrifice and who is the object of knowledge-sacrifice, turn towards him, he prays to Him for His Grace thus

Krato smara Krtam smara Sacrifice, remember, remember that which was done

Krato O sacrifice (O Lord) who are of the form of sacrifice As He says "I (am) sacrifice (*kratu*), I (am) *jagñā*" (Bh Gita IX 16) Or else the word 'sacrifice' refers to meditation because of the context, as (in the passages)

"Whatever a person meditates on in this world, he becomes the same after death" (*Ch Up* VIII 14 v 11)

"He should meditate" (*Ch Up* IV 2)

"One who has meditated thus" (?)

But the word (*kratu*) is (to be taken) through the secondary significance to mean God who is the object of it (*meditation*)

smara Remember Make (us) the object of your mind that is full of grace Just as (in the passage) "O Keśava The fact that you remember us with your mind which is full of love" And it is said by the Lord thus in the passage beginning with "When the mind is steady" "afterwards when he is dying and is like wood and stone, I remember that devotee of mine and lead him to the highest destination" (*Varaha Purana*)¹

¹ *Varaha Purana* of Venkaṭanātha's *Pañcāraṅga-manī* which is devoted to the exposition of the esoteric meaning of the above This verse is not found in the extant *Purāṇa*.

To say in respect of one who at all times directly perceives all, that there is remembrance, means only His looking back at what was done previously.

Kṛtam smara : Remember that which was done : Here also the same meaning is intended. "What little good thing had been done by me, being grateful do you protect me" this is the idea. Or else "remembering all the favours that you have granted me so far please complete the remainder also yourself."

Thus they say in the *Smṛti* "That person when being born" ¹

He himself says thus "To those who seek perpetual communion with me...."² and so on.

The repetition of *Kṛato smara kṛtam smara* is due to the extreme urgency in respect of what has been said (prayed) so far.

XVIII. And again he addresses the Divine, Agni by name, praying that He might lead (him) to his own desired goal, thus :

AGNE NAYA SUPATHĀ RĀYE ASMĀN
VISVĀNI DEVA VAYUNĀNI VIDVĀN
YUYODHY ASMAJ JUHURĀNAM ENO
BHÜYIṢṬHĀM TE NAMA UKTIM VIDHEMA 18

O Agni ! lead us by the Auspicious path to wealth .

O God thou who knowest all knowledge remove from us the crooked sin

To you we sincerely (and repeatedly) utter the word 'NAMAH'

Agne : O Agni ! You who have fire as your body. (This is said in) the *Antāryāmi Brāhmaṇa* "whose body

1. *Mā. Bh. Sānti* 358. 73. "That person whom when being born Madhusudana sees, He is to be known as a good man (*tatvika*) : he verily becomes an aspirer after liberation "

2 *Bh. Gita* X. 10.

is Agni" (*Bh Up V vii 4*) Or else You who have the quality of leading us to the front and others, according to the rule "Jaimini sees no contradiction (if it refers) even directly (to the Lord)" (*Vedanta sutra I ii 29*)

naya lead make us walk

supatha By the good path In other words, by means that are free from any contract with anything prohibited (by scripture)

raye to wealth, which is useful for protecting one's body which exists for the sake of knowledge and for worshipping you and, etc Or else what is intended here is the non-worldly wealth, which is described in these (passages) "Earn that permanent wealth that is incapable of being stolen by the hands of the thief, nor can become the possession of kings, and which is incapable of being divided by kinsmen," and "Infinite indeed is my wealth" (*Mh Bh sants 17 18*)

because that (meaning) is in conformity with the capacity (*artha*) and context (*prakarana*)

The same mantra, qualified by contexts and others, speaks to such different meanings as are in accordance with them thus say those who know the well established rules well

asman us who have no other attitude of mind and who have no other means (than you)

vishvanti deva vayunanti vidvan O God! You who know all knowledges

Deva O God! who have that kind of wonderful play which helps (your) granting our desires

'*Maya vayunam jnanam* are synonyms' say the lexicographers Here, therefore, while indicating 'knowledge by the word 'vayuna' the different special means (*upaya*) (to that wealth) are intended

May you, who know as they are all means of realizing the four-fold ends of life (*dharmārthakāma-moksa*) according to the fitness of each individual, be pleased to lead us, who do not know them: this is the meaning.

juhurānam : That which bothers us because of its being a bond, or else, because of its having crookedness of an unimaginable sort.

enah : The sin which is of the form of performance of actions which are prescribed (*akṛtyakarana*) and of non-performance of those (actions) which are prescribed (*kṛtya-akarana*) and others, and which obstructs the experiencing of You and, etc.

asmat : from us.

Yujodhi : remove, destroy is the meaning.

Bhūyisthām te nama-uktim vidhema : We sincerely and repeatedly utter the word '*namah*'. The interchange (of inflexion) is well-warranted 'by the rules (of grammar).

Or else, one prays to the Divine to help one to continue repeating the word '*namah*'. Verily even those who are liberated are mentioned in the *Moksa dharma* as "those who always utter *namah*".

The intention of the word '*ukti*' is that even though this *namas* is not mental and physical, by the mere utterance of this word '*namah*', He will be pleased to grant His Grace.

Thus the Samhitā has concluded after having taught briefly about the Supreme Being, Its possession (*vibhūti*), meditations on It, and their characteristics.¹

1 The reading of Śrī Kūranārāṇaswamin here is different -
 evam paratattva tad vibhūtiyoga-tadupāsana tatprapdana-
 tatphalaviśesan .

CONCLUDING VERSES

1 ¹Venkateśa, born of the clan of Viśvāmītra, friend of the Universe, wrote through the grace of Hayagrīva,² thus this commentary on the final portion of the Samhitā of the Vajasuneyins which is clear and yet obscure, for the enjoyment of the learned disciples

2 ³How is this *anuvāka* beginning with *Īśa* not opposed to those in this world who hold, that there is identity between all enjoyers⁴, that bound souls are the Supreme⁵, that there is identity and difference⁶, (who accept) the philosophies of the jains and the buddhists⁷, that salvation is not something to be attained⁸ (since all are ever-free) and that fear of bondage is illusion⁹

COLOPHON

Thus the *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad bhāṣya* concludes, amongst the works of *Srī Venkatanātha*, the teacher of *Vedānta*, supreme master of all sciences and lion among poets and logicians

HAIL TO SRĪ VENKATEŚA, THE LION AMONG POETS
AND LOGICIANS ABOUNDING IN AUSPICIOUS
QUALITIES, THE TEACHER OF THE VEDĀNTA¹

1 *Sālinī* metre

2 *Vājirakṛtraprasādit* through the grace of the Horse-headed Being Hayagrīva Haya-vadana, the patron God of Venkatanātha. The play here on the word suggests that since the Lord of the form of Hayagrīva alone gave the Vajasaneyya Samhitā the teaching herein embodied also has the sanction of its original author

3 *Sikharigī* metre

4 *śāśvatsamābhāṣitā*

5 *śāśvatsamābhāṣitā*

6 *śāśvatsamābhāṣitā*

7 *jinaśūnyatā*

8 *śāśvatsamābhāṣitā*

9 *śāśvatsamābhāṣitā*

QUOTATIONS CITED BY SRI VEDANTA DESIKA

Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.

1. अथ नामवेद्यं सत्यस्य सत्यं प्राणा वै सत्यं तेषामेष सत्यम् ।
IV.iii : 2.
2. यः पृथिव्या तिष्ठन्...
V. vii. 6.

Chāndogya Up.

1. ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्रोऽयमुपासीत ।
I. i. 1.
2. सर्वं रक्षिदं ब्रह्मा तन्नानिति शान्त उपासीत । अथ सद्यु
क्रतुमयः पुरुषो यथाक्रतुरस्मिन् लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः
प्रेत्य भवति । स क्रतुं कुर्वीत ।
III. xiv. 1.
3. एतमितः प्रेत्यामिसमवित्तासि ।
III. xiv. 4.
4. तद्यथा हिरण्यनिधिं निहितमध्वेनज्ञा उपर्युपरि सचरन्तो न
विन्देयुरेवमेवेमाः सर्वाः प्रजा अहर्हर्गच्छन्त्य एवं ब्रह्मलोकं
न विन्दन्त्यवृतेन हि प्रत्यूढाः ।
VIII. iii. 2.
5. सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निवर्तन्तेऽपहतपाप्मा ह्येष ब्रह्मलोकः ।
VIII. iv. 1.
6. य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा विजये विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽ-
पिपासः ।
VIII. vii. 1.
7. धूत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंभवामीत्यभिसंभवामीति ।

Katha Up.

- अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समस्तुते ।
II. vi. 14.

Mahā Up.

- एको ह वै नाययण आसीन्न ब्रह्मा नेशानो नापो नाग्नीषोमी ... I. 1.

Mundaka Up.

- प्रवा ह्येते अहदा यशस्या अष्टादशोक्तमवर येषु कर्म ।
एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मूढा जरामृत्युं ते पुनरेवापि यन्ति ॥ I. ii. 6.

Praśna Up

य पुनरेत त्रिमात्रेण ओमित्येतेनैवाक्षरेण पर पुरुषमभिध्यायीत
स तेजसि सूर्ये सपत्न ।

V 5

Subāla Up

एष सर्वभूतान्तरात्माऽपहतशम्भा दि-यो देव एको नारायण

VII

Svetāśvatara Up

- | | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1 | शशौ द्वावजावीशनीशानजा हेका भोक्तृभोगार्थयुक्ता । | I 9 |
| 2 | क्षर प्रधानममृताक्षर हर क्षरात्मानावीशते देव एक । | I 10 |
| 3 | भोक्ता भोग्य प्रेरितारश्च मत्वा सर्वं प्रोक्त त्रिविध ब्रह्ममेतत् । | I 12 |
| 4 | क्षरत्वविद्या ह्यमृत तु विद्या विद्याविधे ईशते यस्तु सोऽन्य । | V 1. |

Taittirīya Up

ब्रह्मविदामोति परम् ।	II 1 1.
असन्नेव स भवति असद् ब्रह्मेति वेद चेत् ।	II vi 1
सत्यञ्चानृतञ्च सत्यमभवत् ।	II vi

Taittirīya Nārāyanānuvāka

पति विश्वस्यात्मेश्वरम् 13
स ब्रह्मा स शिव
सहस्रशीर्षं देव
यच्च किञ्चिज्जगत्पत्तिन् दृश्यते भूयतेऽपि वा ।
अन्तर्हिदृश्यं तत्सर्वं व्याप्य नारायण स्थित ।

Satapatha Brāhmana

अनपहतशम्भाऽहमस्मि नामानि मे धेहि । VI 1 1-10
of Bhāgavata III 12-8 12

Purāna Viṣṇu

सर्वत्रासौ समस्त च वस्तुष्वेति त्रैयम् ।
ततस्त वासुदेवेति विद्महि परिपठ्यते ॥ I 1 12
अविद्या बन्धनं शाऽन्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते । VI vii 61
इयञ्च सोऽपि मुबहून् यज्ञान् शान्ध्याभय ।
ब्रह्मविद्यामधिदाय तं मृत्युमविषया ॥ VI vi 12

Harī Vamśa (Viṣṇu parvan)

ओमित्येव सदा विप्रा पठञ्च ध्यात केशवम् ।

Manusmṛti

योऽसाम्नीन्द्रियग्राह्यं सूक्ष्मोऽध्यक्तं सनातनम् ।

सर्वभूतमयोऽचिन्त्यं स एष स्वयमुद्भूतः ॥

I 7

तपो विद्या च विप्रस्य नि श्रेयसकराबुधौ ।

तपसा कल्मषं हतिं विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥

XII 104

Mahā Bhārata

योऽस्त्वद्रार्कं नक्षत्रं खं दिशो भूर्महोदधिम् ।

यामुदेवस्य वीर्येण विवृतानि महात्मनः ॥ Anuśa 156 136

अनन्तं वनं मे वित्तं यस्य न नास्ति किञ्चन ।

मिथिलया मदीत्याया न मे किञ्चित्पदद्वले ॥

Sānti 17 19 & 178-2

जायमानं हि पुरुषं यं पश्येन्मधुसूदनम् ।

सात्त्विकस्य तु वित्तोपस्रवो वै मोक्षायचिन्तकः ॥ Sānti 358 73

Bhagavadgītā

ओमित्येकाग्रं ब्रह्म व्याहरन्मामनुस्मरन् ।

VIII 13

तेषां सततयुक्तानाम् ।

X 10

Rāmāyana

राममुग्रोन्मार्कस्य देव्येव समजायत ।

हनुमन्तं च मां विद्धि तयार्तुमिहागतम् ॥

Sundarakāṇḍa 35 52.

Viṣṇu Dharma

पराह्मुण्यानां गोविन्दे विप्रासक्तचेतसाम् ।

तेषां तत्परमं ब्रह्म दूराद्दूरतरं स्थितम् ॥

99 14.

तन्मन्त्रेण गोविन्दे ये नरा न्यस्तचेतसः ।

विपदव्यागिनस्तेषां विहरे च तदन्तिके ॥

Ahīrbudhnyā Saṁhita (?) (II 43)

वर्षावृत्तशतेनानि पश्चिरादिव सम्पतन् ।

नैवान्तं वारुण्यशयद्विभ्यामनन्त्रवम् ॥

Varāha Purāna (not found in the extant Purana)

ततस्तु म्रियमाणं तु काष्ठपापाणसन्निभम् ।

अहं स्मरामि मद्भक्तं नयामि परमा गतिम् ॥

Unidentified

1 इन्द्रियाणि मनो बुद्धिः सत्त्वं तेजो बलं धृतिः
वासुदेवात्मकान्याहुः क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञमेव च । (Vis Sah Nāma)

2 शठमतिरुपयाति योऽर्थतृष्णा
पुरुषपशुर्न स वासुदेवभक्तः ।
(Vis Purāna III vii 30-31)

3 परमात्मनि यो रक्तो विरक्तोऽपरमात्मनि ।
(Nārada-parivṛāja Up III)

4 गगायाः शिखरा धारा यथा वर्षन्ति वासवे ।
शक्या गणयितुं लोके न ध्यतीताः पितामहाः ॥
(Vis Smṛti xx 3)

5 स्नेहपूर्णैः मनसा यत्नं स्मरन्ति केशव ।

6 अतस्त्वं स्मरन्त्याह अराजकं शंसदम् ।
अदायादविभगाहं धनमार्जयं सुरिरम् ॥
(cf. Subhāṣitanīvi 1. 2 & Hitopadeśa 1 4)

Vedānta Sūtras Quoted

1. 2 29	साक्षादप्यविरोधे जैमिनि
III 4 13	नाविशेषात्
III. 4 14	स्तुतयेऽनुमतिर्ना
IV 1 16	अग्निहोनादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात्

Pūrva Mīmāṃsā

1 2 16	सर्वव्यवसायिकम्
--------	-----------------

Pāṇini Vyākaraṇa Sūtras

1 4 105	गुण्यपुनरुदे
1 4 107	अगुण्यपुनरुदे
IV 4 123	अगुण्यपुनरुदे

The practice of the destruction and the practice of birth are two stages of a single phenomenon, but they are both needed. The results that occur from them are individual results, resulting in the knowledge of the Divine which alone confers the boon of *Amṛtanubhava* immortality-experience. The sense of creatureliness, dependence, recognition of the Highest Being as in all things and beings, as controlling, ordering and destining all creatures, as the supporter, creator as well as destroyer, are indeed included in the definition of the Divine Lord. The darkness of the night, and the deepening frightfulness of the forests, the high protrusions and huge sizes of the rocks and boulders, wide expanses of water and deep gorges and ravines are phenomena that strike terror in human hearts, and display the greatness of the Creator who far surpasses any calculation of strength by us. The glory of the stars and regularity in the periods of the day and night, and all eclipses reveal that the ruler is governing the world according to Order, *Rita*. Even Kant and Goethe succumbed to the religious attitude because of the Supernatural nature of the Divine Order. They could unsettle Nature, make it phenomenal, but God they never could dislodge. The Ontological argument of Anselm could never be divorced from the Cosmological. Des Cartes built up his entire doubting system on the basis of this axiom of Inner Ruler, Demon who must exist to delude at least but who would never condescend to delude him.

The religious consciousness then is existent, it is law-abiding, rational, and never sensational. It is aware of the greatness and grandness of Creation, and aware also that the human individual can never be its creator. It seeks to know, to understand, to solve the mystery, the most central, of man's dependence and existence in the mystery—the most central, of man's dependence and existence in the total order of things. To experience it is the one and only aspiration. The main features of such a consciousness so far the west is concerned is found in the lives of Spinoza and Leibniz who were pluralists and conscious of their dependence on the Divine. The Bhakti cult rests profoundly on the

feeling of dependence and a seeking after the fullest exemplification of that dependent relation. Those schools are fundamentally religious systems which teach the practice of dependence on the One supreme Lord. Theism or the acceptance of God is the acceptance of the dependence of man and all creatures on Him, in whom they live and move and have their being. That the bhakti might be explosive and emotional or rational and resigned does not in the least take away from it the quality of utter dependence on God. Man is met in the life of the bhakta as part of God, and only through God are others realized as brothers and participators in God's Lila.

In mysticism then, life is an adventure—a progress made by the individual—a purusakara towards the ideal of utter self-realization not different at earlier stages for the seeking of independence. This struggle for independence is quite different from the struggle for dependence. But on a profounder consideration, just like the doctrine of negation where all negation is determination, so also struggle after independence (negation) is indeed the struggle after dependence (affirmation) on God. It is this significant fact that is evident from the Upanishadic teaching.

The history of the growth of Indian thought might well be said to illustrate the two tendencies. It is undoubted that the idea of God is the first and foremost feature. In fact, the Rig Veda is said to represent the evolution of God through the Gods who belong to several planes and represent the incarnation of the forces of various malefic and benefic kinds. The recognition of the two-fold nature of the forces itself is sufficient warrant for the impending struggle, religious as well as ethical. Gods of light and life are invoked against the forces of darkness and death. But it is clear that the hope and trust in the Divine alone can make life triumph. God must become the master of Maya and indeed utilize it for manifesting his greatness. The dialectic works thus towards the *distinct superiority and lordship of the Divine Lord*. Knowledge of the Divine leads to transcendence and conquest over death and disintegration, defeat and disaster.

Action that men do, must be action that is sanctified by knowledge. Ignorant action it is that leads to death, whereas action that is governed by knowledge is what leads to liberation and true creation. The Seer who sees far beyond the present, whose vision transcends the limits of ordinary perception, one who is *kranta darsi*, executes his action from the transcendental standpoint, sub-specie eterni it may be, for that is the meaning of the *kranta darsi*, a free man thus is one who in almost every respect resembles his God.

The mystical consciousness also has this danger of being diverted to mere struggle after abstract freedom, *kevalatva*. The *samkhyam purusa* is the standing witness of mere freedom. Such a being who stands alone in his isolation is little comfort. Nor is the Buddhistic Buddha who has attained Nirvana very different from such a lonely figure. It is impossible for such lonely creatures to survive their loneliness. It is with characteristic brilliance that the Vedic passage intimates that God even feeling lonely sought out His Creation. Even the transcendent requires the phenomenal, the Divine the human. No wonder the fall (or at least the so called fall) from the supreme isolationism of Samkhya and Buddhism to the latter stages of the same doctrines is significant of the truth. Just as the Intellectualized fictions of ritualism or representative symbolism can not long sustain an atmosphere of non empiricism or pseudo-empiricism and has to come to terms with *Yathārtha jnana*, real knowledge of the concrete human situation and knowledge and growth and struggle (as Platonism also fully was made to feel), so also mere struggle after liberty from all limitations and impediments has to come to terms with the realization of the Supreme on whom all are dependent, and indeed has to join its forces with such an effort.

Such then is the general thesis of the paper. The fact about our spiritual life consists in a four-fold activity. First and foremost the realization and deepening consciousness of the living presence which can be said to be synthetic knowledge. Such a knowledge far from being mere intellectualization of life

is a dynamic source of all action Knowledge becomes the bed rock of synthetic action Such action and such knowledge intermingle so fully that in the words of Bergson, knowledge and action (*ubhaya saha*) are indistinguishable

To know is to be Equally to know is to practise the destruction of barriers to understanding and progress of spiritual life And to make all efforts are rebirth or birth into the spiritual Illumination It is this fourfold intermingling that constitutes an integral yoga Body and mind and Spirit and Realisation all participate in the Yoga

The psychology of the Saint shows not merely the dynamic introvert struggle of the Mystic but also the extrovert adoration of the Deity whom he apprehends The problem of relationship between religious and mystical consciousness is not to be studied either in isolation or in their initial expressions The maturity of these ought to be considered The saint is either a demented idealist, a self hallucinating individual nor an insane dictator struggling to be All and Everything in Himself The Saint is a mature being and in a sense a realized soul, a mahatma, an integral Self This being the case we cannot entertain the views of Santayana or Leonard Woolfe or of those psychologists of Religion who consider religious (mystical) experiences to be regressions of personality into the primitive or invasions of the primitive libido of the normal The mystical consciousness if it be studied in its normal evolution gradually sheds away the barriers to fullest experience and realizes its place in the Ultimate scheme of things The religious consciousness when it is traced from its origins also reveals the final end to be the realization of the freedom from all barriers except the one and fundamental and inalienable realization of the Unity of the Individual in the All, an *aprthaksiddha sambandha* of the futile with the infinite including, however, in every other respect equality

Thus the realization of the Unity is foundational in the Mystic as well as the Religious effort This realization is of the form of Vision and Experience rolled into one, and means the

liberation from death as well as enjoyment of Immortality or Bliss (*amṛtatva*) Intuition is the result of both, but this intuition is at once *Atmanubhava* as well as *Brahmanubhava* in its final fullness The mystic, if he merely pursues the path of destruction of barriers without the initial knowledge of the Omnipervasiveness of the All in All, will end in darkness and ignorance Religious Consciousness, if it excludes the realization of the freedom from barriers and concentrates on the *Brahmanubhava* alone, will, it is affirmed, lead to greater darkness or rather ignorance The point made out is that such crises might occur or rather have occurred We can trace the danger of the former, but it appears at first sight difficult to affirm the latter. All the same, it is a fact that the two must go together, the freedom from barriers to true realisation is part and parcel of the effort to realize Brahman-Experience

Sri Vedanta Desika points out that these two are essentially the Unity regarding the Experience of Brahman, and both must be practised together Here he speaks as a *Yogin*, and not as a mere interpreter He starts his commentary that the first and fundamental illusion of man is regarding his own freedom, but that does not permit the individual to surrender his activities which shall further or advance his realization of the Brahman Actions, obligatory actions as prescribed by the *sastras*, have to be performed, and prescribed actions must be given up To perform actions that tend to realize mere darkness of the soul, ignorance, is to nullify oneself It is prescribed action that has to be done, and all prescribed actions have as their test the Omnipervasiveness and Control of the Deity mentioned in the opening mantra of the *Isavasyopanisad* The descriptions of the Deity that follow are all intended to guide the action of man from the attitude of *dharma*, the real *dharma* of the individual being dependence on the supreme Lord The divine sustains the actions of all individuals but it is the individual who has to do the actions in accordance with his own inner *svadharma*, which is the dependence on the Lord (*paradhinatva*) By such a supreme *paradhinatva*, the individual realizes a state of being non-

different from the Lord Himself as shown exquisitely by the first and second case endings of the Mantra XI which could be interchanged without losing the meaning and import of the mantra. Then comes the instruction of unitary practice of Action and Knowledge intimated in the first and second verses as well as the unitary practice of Asambhuti and Sambhuti, destruction of barriers to Brahmanubhava and the effort to realize Brahmanubhava. That Brahmanubhava is called also Birth, Sambhuti, is a well established fact. That in the Upanishads also such a usage is available is proved by the quotations from the Chandogya Upanishad

Sarvakarma sarvakama sarvagandha sarvarasas sarva-
midam abhyatto'vakyanadara esama atma ntahrdaya
etadbrahma itah pretyabhisambhavadatmi

Again

Syamacchabalam prapadye sabalacchayam prapadye'-
sva iva romaṇi vidhuya papam candra iva rahormukhat
pramucya ahutva sarīram akṛt kṛtatma brahmalokam
abhisambhavamityabhisambhavamḥ (Chand Up , VIII
xiii 1)

In both these places the ordinary translation is that of attaining the Brahmaloka. That is indeed the birth into reality which is everything. Therefore the Isavasyopanishad usage of sambhuti has its connection and integration with the Chandogya passage and has to be interpreted in the same manner.

The merit of this usage is clear when it is discovered from the context that the teaching here is regarding the practice of Brahmanubhava and nothing less. Once the meaning of Sambhuti is fixed then, the meaning of its negative Asambhuti is easily discovered. The asambhuti means the destruction of birth. But can we ever practise anything that is positively destruction of pure and simple and can asambhuti or destruction mean destruction alone? Destruction is here defined as that destruction which leads to conquest over destruction or death. Thus the asambhuti here intimated is the destruction of death, and death means the surrender to forces that lead to ignorance.

APPENDIX II

MEDITATION ON THE ĪŚAVĀSYOPANISAD

By DR K C VARADACHARI

I have always felt that Upanisads should be read as instructions in *Sādhanā* rather than metaphysical statements about the Nature of Reality, though it must be well understood that no *sādhanā* can proceed without a reality view. Every Upanishad is a *Vijyā* and should be meditated upon as the *Amṛta* used to do, rather than discussed about for the mere purpose of objective knowledge. This meditation leads to inward understanding, occult and profound of the subject matter, however difficult of comprehension it may appear to be at the beginning. Meditation is also silent prayer, inward and deep, and communion, a communion with reality in its depths rather than in its surface forms, merely, and as such it is something that passes into knowledge or *consciencing*, or *śamant bhakti rūpa* (knowledge of the form of devotion). It is well known that there is no Upanishad which enfolds so much of value and synthesis in the brief as comprises other than the Īśavāsyopaniṣad. In meditation of its meditable portion that is the final four verses (mantra—15 to 18) which is asked to be meditated upon, or used as Prayer-formula, I was singularly struck by the remarkable series of impressions registered in my consciousness. I am trying to share these meditations on the Supreme Being, the 'I' of all beings and things, with all.

I. The first prayer

HIRANMAYĪNA PĀTRENA

ŚATYASYĀPIHITAM MUKHAM

IAI IVAM PŪṢANAPĀVRNU

ŚATYADIHARMĀYA DRSTAYE

clearly reveals that the individual soul covered over by Ignorance, here described as the Passion coloured (Golden) lid, is unable to see the Lord in everything outward. The earlier instructions in the sixth and seventh verses *sarvabhūteṣu ca ātmānam* and *sarvāni bhūtāni ātmānaḥ tīrthāni* and *sarvaṇi bhūtāni*

atmavabhut 'the self in all beings, 'all beings in the Self' and 'the Self as that which has become all beings', are incapable of being realized or experienced through the senses, and even as the *Kenopanisad* has beautifully stated *Yad vaca nabhyuditam yena vagabhyudyate, Yan manasa na manute yenahur mano matam, yaccaksusa na pasyati yena caksumsi pasyati yacchrotrena na śro noti yena śrotram idam śrotram yat pranena na praniti yena pranah pranyate* it is through the Self we see, hear, think, breathe, speak

Thus the subject of all experiences is the Self, not only in respect of each individual but also in respect of all individuals. This Self is in all beings and it is this Self nature that is to be known. It could only be known when the passion coloured lid is removed. It is the Truth Nature. Man aspires for the removal of this lid that prevents the realisation of truth function or truth nature. Every other function of the self such as sensing, thinking, breathing and speaking is not the real function since they cannot intimate the original truth of the self. Thus it is, that this Being, unseeable by the senses, is capable of being seen in a mind that is absolutely quiet and calm. A strong and impregnable calm in the necessity of the soul, this may mean that there is much reserve strength of faith in the truth-nature to sustain any loss that the loss of passions might have caused. More fully this calm must be conceived as very difficult of arriving by means of any ignorant move or passion or will that is egoistic, and it must therefore appear that it would be incapable of being achieved by the individual out of his own ignorant volition or ideation or emotion. The mental peace or *prasada* that is stated to be possible to a soul that has got rid of all outward desire and crushed out all emotive and mental movements of the *citta*, is something attained through the practice of inhibition of the same constantly through *atkhya* and discrimination. It is true here that though the soul possesses all this practice and discrimination and has attained the necessary peace too and calm contentless existence there survives yet the egoism, the true lid golden as it is stated attractive and beautiful, and yet it is something that has to be

Asambhuti thus involves double negation, negation of negation. This construction is peculiar and yet this is valid because of the context wherein it is used. The phrase does not occur anywhere else in the Upanisads, and therein lies the uniqueness of this meaning. This is therefore another crucial passage in the explanation and interpretation of the Upanisadic philosophy.

The mystical consciousness being the dynamic "other" (itara) of the religious, and the destroyer of the barriers to birth or knowledge of the Divine, a negator or negation, is what is identified here as Asambhuti. Śrī Sankara's view that Asambhuti must be taken to be pralaya, is undoubtedly worthy of consideration taken independently out of the context, but is ruled out in this context. Nor could birth and death be practised together by any individual. One cannot practise either destruction or creation on a universal scale. The meaning that birth itself promotes dissolution is undoubtedly a better rendering than that of Sankara but then these are two processes or turn-efforts aimed at realizing ends which are different. The use of the word asambhuti is not significant, so significant as to yield the meaning of the word in the earlier passage as that which leads to the darkness of ignorance. Nor is Śrī Madhavacarya's rendering of the two words asambhuti as destroyer and Sambhuti as creator acceptable though from a theist's stand point it is by far the most acceptable. God has to be meditated upon not only as creator but also destroyer or rather as both (cf. Vedānta Sūtras which speak of Brahman as creator, destroyer etc. Janmadyasya yatah I : 2). Śrī Vedānta Desika finds that the whole Upanisad is based on the foundation of an instruction of the Guru to his pupil and the second half of the Upanisad is devoted to the instruction of practice.

Mokṣa and Ananda are the two fruits of all practice, freedom from limitations as well as enjoyment of the Brahman are two results that Mysticism in conjunction with Religious consciousness achieves. Radical mysticism which is indistinguishable from emotional outbursts which produces more heat than light, tends to realize the hallucinatory freedom. Radical

fundamentalism erroneously called religious consciousness leads one to the contracted and p*rrverted emotionalism of the opposite kind. To escape from both, without abandoning the crucial essence of these two thirsts or instincts is the method of synthesis. The synthesis must be organic and not merely a patched up compromise. Emotion is the one thing that has to be canalized and made to perform the liberating task as well as realizing task of Man. Else Split personalities will result. The corrective to the mystical consciousness is the intelligent understanding of the Universal Being taught in the opening mantra. The corrective to the religious is the acceptance of the mystical goal the realization of the plane of life the fullness of existence characteristic of the Divine. Life to be significant must embrace the richness, and the fullness of the Divine life here, and on this plane of human thought too. The organic fusion of the mystical and the religious under the aegis of the all saving knowledge of the Omnipervasive Divine Lord, leads to the profound sense of the Organic which is the truth of existence, the unitas multiplex of all existence is thus realized in a wonderful manner, intimated by the most luminous statement of Unity expressed by the phrase *Soham asmi*.

A close study of the commentary of Sri Vedanta Desika will throw significant light on the Upanisadic philosophy. The approach towards the understanding of the basic concept of Unity in terms of the Organic Theism of Ramanuja and Sri Vaisnavism is found to yield better results than any other approach, now that Absolutisms and Realisms Personalisms and Holisms have been found to present unsynthetic studies of great problems.

removed This removal is stated to be possible only by or, through the Grace of God, Pusan, the Nourisher—Protector, the Supreme Godhead who is the One of whom the sages speak variously, because of different functions that He simultaneously discharges spontaneously felicitously and through puissant Grace This luminous Peace is a Presence of the Divine, different in kind in a sense from the preliminary unstable peace attained through one's own will and contra-will This peace is a revelatory Peace, a permanent and abiding true peace-nature that is the foundational nature of the individual soul in its unity with the Divine

It is interesting always to find a myth in keeping with or corresponding to this discovery of a depth that is essentially to be probed, for it is the problem of the nature of the individual self as to whether it can only arrive at a golden peace impermanent and capable of being defeated, or a true peace permanent and incapable of any disturbances despite all these occurring The puranic analogue here is the story of Hiranyakaśipu, the golden bedded or gold vested or gold coated being, a vital being (titan), mighty and dark with passion, who searched as no man or God did for the omnipervader Viṣṇu, who, he had heard, was the enemy of all egoedness, egoed eyedness (Hiranyakṣa) greedy eyed or greed covered soul, of thieves or usurper robbers of what really belongs to the Omnipervasive Īśvara He Hiranyakaśipu, even like his brother Hiranyakṣa, was an ectype of the Arch demon dragon Vṛtra, the serpent-symbolized being who encompassed all the worlds, even as the other Vedic figures like Vala, Paṇi were and the Puraṇic Naraka, Taraka, Ravana were They made it impossible for the true nature to flow out They sequestered Truth, confined it, penned it in the Cave (of the Heart) making it impossible for it to emerge out of it In the Heart is hidden the soul and Deity of the size of the thumb, brilliant and eternal the self of all beings It was His lid of passion or egoism that was hindering the perception of the Omnipervader whom his son, Prahlada, his own higher Buddha, despite all the tortures and punishments was proclaiming to be everywhere, it was this that was prayed

for to be removed. Perhaps it is as well that we should remember that there are differences between souls—divisions that cut across our prejudices and castes perhaps,—and souls are marked either Āsura, Manusa and Daiva (Man being bi valent either including to the Asura or Deva) or sattva rajasa and tamasa. It is even possible to hold that each of the former may have three divisions as shown in the latter, thus Asuras may belong to the sattva or rajasa or tamasa kinds even as the Gods may. So Vibhīšana and Trijata among the Asuras were considered to be sattvika asuras even as Prahlada and Mahabali have belonged to the sattvika Āsura jati. The prayer that is addressed to the Divine as the One Lord of all creatures, Prajapati, the father and parent not only of Gods and men but even of the Asuras. The prayer is necessitated by the ardent fury of the frustrated passion-governed soul which thought of itself as the Self.

It is in one sense true that what man has made by ignorance man may unmake by means of knowledge. But ego is not merely a nucleus of the Divine effulgence but also a constellation of habits of thought and sense and volition and sentiment. It is this latter that is usually called the self or soul by many and it is this which modern psychology recognizes as the self or personality even as the purely rationalistic Buddhist schools conceived it to be, and therefore rightly denied its permanence. There is yet a truth in individuality which is not egoism which is entirely fundamentally a centre of Divine Being, a secret manyness of the Divine. It is this that is unreachable by thought and sense and volition because it is the universal that is uniquely individualised but that is egoed as a possessive Being. This secret could be wrested only by the Self, that is, the Divine. As we have already pointed out the truth becomes clear when we agree to consider that there are supramental or divinised beings mental beings and effulgent vital beings. The first is a class by itself and has never probably suffered from this disaster of separation from the centre, the Truth, *Satya dharma*, a separation resulting from the covering by the lid. It is only the human mental and the asuraic vital beings who are in need of

a useful bye product There is absolutely no evidence to show that there is any other substance than the perceived unity of sense or matter This being the reading of materialism the question about the existence of the soul or spiritual essence becomes all important for any system of spiritual philosophy (Vedānta) or Religion

Idealism no doubt has done yeoman service in the cause of establishing the priority of mind (consciousness) and its indispensability and the omni-effectiveness of Mind But these conclusions it has arrived at through the abstract activity of thought or reason or intellection which distinguishes or extracts the principles or laws of thought or axioms or categories of experience from the mass of presented sensations feelings, dispositions and instincts, belonging to the changing flux which is characteristic of the universe of matter (sensory world) These ideas or reals or essences or principles or axioms or values that it has extracted or analysed from the '*A priori Synthesis*' (of Kant's *Metaphysics*) it has sought to unify or integrate or systematize into a universe with the help of the principles of coherence and non-self contradiction as between themselves A reality so built up of these 'ideas' does indeed confer a permanence to the unity of thought, and may even be, in a truer measure, a reality of the mind—for really every thinking being feels himself to be a mind But then this unity of reality in which the rational alone is real has been accepted to be just a bloodless ballet of impalpable categories', whilst it did deliver the mind from the sensations feelings and fleeting existence, it did not liberate the mind from itself, that is to say from its own structure, in order to permit activity or search or realization of that in the world It could not satisfy the structure of experience which constantly overflows the categories of both abstract thinking and sensory being Philosophy secured a permanence and even a type of peace but not that which satisfies even its own inward drive towards all-round acceptance of integral being The absolute of the idealist certainly could not be called a self or a soul Reactions in the shapes of radical empiricism, positivism, pragmatism and realisms of the critical

and neo-varieties had indeed intervened as anticipated. But what was needed was not more materialism, but more of idealism and an acceptance of the fact that real progress should lead to a deeper and profounder truth of the self or spirit or mind than was made possible by intellectual idealism. The abstract activity of the intellect only protested against the sensory fleeting experiences, little knowing or discerning that the intellect itself is but a habit of being, and only the manufacturer of the permanent structure of matter against its own fleeting structure.

The mystic always attempted a higher type of abstraction through a process that combined the intellectual type of abstraction or negation with the process of psychological renunciation of the sensory. This *nivṛtti* or abstraction that is two pronged enabled his Yoga to go beyond the intellect itself to a state of being that might be called *nirvāṇa*—*vana* less that is, without any type of *citta vṛtti*. This further made it possible for him to discover the utter duality between the soul and its body, and therefore helped 'death' or 'psychical death'. This psychical death is not a mere symbolic or mimetic act of dying but a real dying to the body so as to live to the soul, and incidentally making the body an instrument awakened to its soul's real and ultimate destiny, as against the present tendency of making the soul awakened to the destiny of the body. It is a death in a deeper and more intensive form than the physical death (civil or municipal death) which is but the termination of one's body, a biological death. The delusion that the body is the soul can never be got over unless or until the individual can release the soul from the tentacles of matter and the body that is physically understood as the configuration of instincts, desires and ideations and purposes or cravings, and make it move out of and into the latter at will. No doubt the greatest assertion of the Mimamsakas and others has been that unless we accept that there is a fundamental distinction between the body and the soul and predicate *immortality* or at least *indestructibility* to it, the injunctions of the Vedas that promise experiences in the heaven, world, etc., will have no validity, a situation that is

intolerable But this is not enough At least the Veda does intimate this 'unsheathing' as something devoutly to be wished for, for it speaks about a state of being of the Rsis who knew fully and in experience of this absolute difference between the body and its soul or rather the soul and its bodies This 'unsheathing' is an experience that is got in the state of ecstasy or integral absorption or concentric meditation and is explained as a *siddhi* (or to use the Buddhistic phrase '*iddhi*') in Yoga (Hindu as well as Jaina) The *jīvanmukta* is one who at least knows and experiences the freedom of the soul in the body and this experience is not one merely of absolute control over the organs of sense and action and *antahkarana* but a radical disjunction that is only short of a total abandonment. I do not hold that this is desirable or all that Yoga is aiming at, but this radical otherness of these components of the Organic is a thing that must first be learnt, and from this alone can arise knowledge and a being that entails a further step on the evolutionary unfoldment This abstraction of the real 'psychic being' not merely on the level of thought and mind but also the *Jagrat* level of waking consciousness and physical being is indeed very difficult Many hold that this is dangerous (So at least the ancient occult literatures hold) Without the guidance and grace of God or the Divine powers it will mean lot of pain and even death, that entails a new effort in another life But without this knowledge being achieved and realized fully with the help of reason and emotion, and a dynamic awareness, the illusion of body-soul (*dehatma bhrama*) is incapable of being finally and utterly rooted out Till then we shall continue to be helpless against the onslaughts of radical empiricism and scientific materialism. Biological death does not and cannot perform this act for us, for it can only liberate us from the outer shell or coat of perceptible existence outworn by experience, but not the subtle sheath which is stated to carry forward our *sancita-karma* That is precisely the reason why we have to choose the 'psychic death', the death that means the business of realization of our 'otherness' out of love of true liberation This is achieved by knowledge that even transcends abstract reason and is grostic or supramental, or at least intuitive

Thus the primary necessity emerges, in whatever way we may think, for a definite and complete vindication of the principle of the difference between the individual soul and its body, and any attempt to refer it to any *pramana* is almost to deny to the self what is promised to the mind. It breeds always the fear of a possibility of fall or illusion. The promise of divine knowledge that from that there is no fall or regress (*acyuta* knowledge or *anantitas* ascent) can never be kept. The *siddhas* have always taken the view that truths of vedic experience ought to be experienced and ought to be taken seriously.

Thus we come to an important point in our meditation when we find that the primary test visualised by the seeking vital soul (*Hiraṇyakaśipu*) was the invocation to Death and even may we say a willingness to see the truth through, whether indeed the Divine is in oneself, a fact that would settle two things at one stroke. What the enlightened Soul, *Prahlada* knew and experienced through his own sufferings at the hands of the Egoistic matter-ridden being, is now being questioned radically by the latter. This is the cult of the intrepid warrior. A warrior in battle is prepared to die for some duty, or principle or loyalty. This preparedness to die is an actual asset in the solution of the problem of soul-body delusion. The 'psychical death' is effected at the very moment of the will to die in order to live. That it is a crude method and even a violent method does not vitiate the fact that it is a method. In the second chapter of the *Gita* Bhagavan Śrī Kṛṇa teaches the most important truth that the soul is unborn and that the body is perishable and is a coat that is worn and cast off when it has served the purpose, and even if the soul were but perishable it is better to die for a cause that is ultimate or for the sake of ordained *kṣatradharma*. The metaphysical implication underlying this counsel is to get over the *bhrama* that visits even very advanced souls, like Śrī Arjuna not only in respect of oneself but also in respect of other selves or souls. Further it is necessary to experiment with truth for the sake of absolute knowledge. Thus the *kṣatriya-dharma* prepares for the

Siddhis even may appear to reveal the possibilities of the material existence only rather than the nature of the Spirit that is other than it. Obviously then when the search for the Divine took place He could not be caught anywhere by Hiranyakaśipu, for it is naively remarked by the Purana that the Divine entered into His nose. Is it not as the *Kenopaniṣad* states by the Divine that one smells or knows or hears? The psychic death was sure to come, but not until one is prepared for the worst does it pass off lightly, or joyously illuminating the interiors and revealing the separateness by dismissing or sublimating the delusion. Otherwise the worst must be faced many times. The truth of intelligence is that it is 'ekasanta grahī', whereas ignorance is 'anekasantagrahī'. The former requires no repetition the latter does. Prahlāda did not need repetition for he was Buddha, Hiranyakaśipu was instinct and needed all the violence of the spiritual to overcome its inward resistance. It is true that modern mystics and other generous souls who think that theoretical philosophizing and acceptance of idealism or absolutism insufficient will find that all that has been written above merely clarifies the mystic sincerity and will scare away only drawing room philosophers. For others it is a welcome adventure in the spaces of 'spirit' which will resolve the many controversies of philosophers and make for honest experience and practical spirituality. That does not mean that we need to bid good bye to philosophizing. As already pointed out it is the business of this dynamic experiment of Vedantic knowing (*Sāṅkhya Yoga* in the language of Śrī Kṛṣṇa), to lift up the understanding from the barren constructs of superficial abstractions. We can then proceed to see in the next two mantras the same illumined consciousness that has beheld the One Unity of all Godheads and its own self, now resolves to offer up itself in utter consecration for the sake of an integral transformation. The self or soul is immortal, an immortal portion of the Divine—a truth, which has no fixed habitation nor are its bodies permanent. The truth has been learnt that the self is other than the body (*Śarīra*). For it is a truth that a body is an instrument of a self which exists by reason of the

soul or self within, which utilises it and enjoys it for some occult purpose or secret delight, and there is no particular reason to hope that these purposes are either eternal or permanent delights, though delight be the very nature of the Self-delight that enjoys the Oneness as well as secret manyness, or manyness and its secret oneness, being (as well as becoming, which are just the conceptual representations of this two fold delight of Transcendent Being) Now the sacrifice of the self or one of its manyness is sometimes held to be a necessity, a necessity of the truth of the former occult knowledge. Sacrifice or the Rite of Sacrifice is a total consecration to the Divine Lord of all Enjoyments and offering and not, as is usually held, a renunciatory act, an act that merely breathes the air of denudation however free from inward sorrow at non possession of that which was possessed. The Body it is that is to be offered along with the inward self to the Supreme One Being, the Omnipervader Īśa. It is by this act, apparently of a total surrender of all possessions (as is intimated in the very first mantra of the *Īśa* *tyaktena bhujitha*), that the fullest riches of the transcendent kind (*rayi*) (*Śreyas* of the *Katha* and the *Gita*) are attained. Thus it is that the awakened soul, seeking the fullest sovereignty and empire resolves upon the Great Rite and conquest of the Viśva through sacrifice. This sacrifice is sometimes called the Viśvajit sacrifice or the Aśvamedha sacrifice. In these sacrifices the gifts or *dakṣina* are to be one's fullest possessions. The Viśvajit sacrifice of Vājasr̥avas father of Naciketas, or the Aśvamedha of Maha Bali is the greatest sacrifice, in this sense that it has a great mystic meaning. He who would possess (the) All must lose all or give or give away all other possessions and not 'give up all' to others. This was the *pratigna* the resolution or resolve of the sacrificer who had awakened to the Joyful Wisdom (Prahlada). And it is clear that it would not have been a complete sacrifice but for the coming of Vamana, the Dwarf brahmana, who claimed the three feet by His measure as Lord of the Three Feet being the Fourth as OM (A U M) interpreted as Earth (Vaiśvānar) as Midatmosphere (Tajasa) (the subliminal abode of the *rajas*).

Āthopaniṣad and the Agni *Agnirahasyopaniṣad* of the Satapatha Brahmana) which is invariably completed by the Divine's acceptance in person of the intimate identity that is the reality-function between the indwelling seer and the super conscient Universal. It is this utter and total acceptance that is usually-spoken of as the realization of the establishment of the Seat of Brahman in the Heart, the achievement of the Ānanda, the Rasatala of Mahabalī. It is this beatitude that has been stated to be the result of a complete surrender. It is as it were the shifting of the centre of action from the individual ego to the Universal Person the Cosmic and supraconscious supracosmic Divine. It is not without significance that the Seer Priest who officiates at the sacrifice of Mahabalī is Śukra (*Iṣa* 8) for on the path of real and fundamental divine evolution the Leader, the Sacrificer, Priest every part of the process of ascension passing on transformation is achieved by the Divine for the Divine and in the Divine, the individual soul playing the part of a quiet aspiring flame fed and lifted up unto union.

Surrender or Śaranagati Vidyā is stated to have six steps anukulyasya Sankalpa (willing the helpful to ascent), Pratikulyasya Varjanam (renouncing the obstructive), goptṛtva varanam (electing the Goal), Mahaviśvasa (radical faith in the Divine) Ātmaniksepa (placing of the self at the feet of God), and Karpanya (complete dependence involving a feeling of helplessness without the Divine). We can see in those four mantras of the *Īśavasyopaniṣad* (15-18) these six in some form in the 15th verse—Satyadharmaya dṛṣṭaye' refer to this willing of the helpful (i), whereas the prayer to the Divine Nourisher (Pusan) to uncover the golden lid that covers the face of Truth is the renunciation of the obstructing forces (ii), the 16th mantra in its first part 'Tat te rupam kalyāṇatamam paśyami' is the wish of the votary to see the Divine auspicious form and thus forms the third step (iii), whereas the belief that the self of the worshipper and that of the Solar Orb is the expression of the great faith in the Omni selfness of Gōd the mahaviśvasa (iv), in the 17th verse we have the expression of the Ātmaniksepa, surrender (Kṛtam) or

reveals the eternal, and this intermingling in the process of civilization, through poetry, art, sculpture, dance and philosophy and sciences, clearly portends so simple intellectual understanding. On the contrary rationalism has tended to be dogmatic and has ceased to see the confusion into which its own analyses have landed it. Spiritual understanding or gnostic being will clearly interleave the historical with that which is suprahistorical and grant meanings not available in the one or the other exclusively. The fundamental manner of interpretation was long ago envisaged in the Brahmanic literature, but we have grown so much intellectual these days that we have for a long time unaccustomed to see more than one aspect at a time and this seeing of one aspect did the trick of depriving us of the fruits and visions of the entire reality. To quote the Īśa (9) again "Andham tamah pravisanṭi Ye'vidyām upasate tato bhuya iva te tamo ya u vidyayam ratah (see also the 12th mantra). Thus it is necessary to interpret the whole body of literature as an organic whole. This is undoubtedly difficult and may lead to lot of confusion and may be called Research in the strict and literal sense of the term, but this is not the research that will get the applause of the savants and scholars of the present day. It means the seeing of things temporal and eternal in one sweep and this one is forced to say 'sadly' is possible only to one supramentally awakened to the deep and foundational unity of the two by a radical experience.

BHAVAN'S LIBRARY, BOMBAY-7.

NB—This book is issued only for one week till 1/10/75

This book should be returned within a fortnight
from the date last marked below

Date	Date	Date
9 NOV 1974		
12 NOV 1976		
17 .. 1978		
26 APR 1979		
24 FEB 1981		
20 APR 1983		
25 FEB 1984		